

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

is one of the many tragedies of religious history perhaps, indeed, its supreme tragedy—that the which might have united, and doubtless was tended to unite, all who are conscious of their infinite debt to Christ, should be precisely the rite which, in point of sorry fact, has most deeply divided them. We refer, of course, to the Lord's Supper. Perhaps it would not be quite fair to call it a scandal, though such it must inevitably seem to those who by any group of Christians are excluded from participating with them in the sacred rite; those who exclude them are as sincere as they themselves. But in an age when, by such an organization as the League of Nations, we are reaching out towards some genuine human brotherhood, it does seem passing strange that men who love the Lord and whose personal faith and character are beyond reproach should find it impossible to gather together round the Table of their common Lord.

---

A re-examination, therefore, of what the Lord's Supper essentially is and means, if it be conducted without polemics and with the single desire to ascertain the ultimate truth about it, can hardly fail to be welcome to those who value Christian brotherhood. Such a re-examination has been made by the Rev. A. F. SIMPSON, M.A.(Edin.), D.(Lond.), in *The Communion of the Lord's Supper: Its Meaning for Christian Experience*, published by Messrs. Ivor Nicholson & Watson at 6d. net. The method of the discussion is scientific, but its aim is a practical one; and in this

it is typical of much of the best religious writing of the present day, which, while familiar with all the academic apparatus, keeps its eye steadily on the needs and problems of the day in which our lot is cast. In the practical part of his discussion the questions Mr. SIMPSON seeks to answer are these: 'What our Lord meant when at the farewell meal He uttered the familiar words about His body and blood; what is the nature of His presence in the Communion; who is the real Celebrant at the Supper; why the idea of sacrifice has been associated with the rite; and why Christians should want to perpetuate the observance.' It will hardly be denied that these are vital questions.

---

Mr. SIMPSON answers these questions by reverting to the Christian literature and the Christian practice, with the conceptions underlying it, of the first two centuries. The New Testament rightly occupies by far the most prominent place in the discussion—the statement in the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts, with the Pauline and Johannine conceptions; but this is followed by a consideration of the Didache, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus. Naturally the Eucharistic discourse, attached in Jn 6 to the story of the Multiplication of the Loaves, is drawn into the discussion; also several passages in Acts whose relevance, though probable, is not quite so certain, such as Paul's breaking of the bread on board the storm-tossed ship (27<sup>35</sup>).

---

Much of the interest of the book centres round

the question whether magical ideas were associated with the sacrament in, for example, the mind of Paul. A few of his words might conceivably be interpreted as pointing that way ; but it is as good as certain that, considering Paul's antecedents and education, and in view of the whole trend of the Jewish mind as exhibited in the Old Testament, which was the basis of Paul's religious training, this would be a lamentable misinterpretation. It is true that towards the close of the first century there was a tendency in the Gentile Church to associate a magical efficacy with the Lord's Supper : this was only natural to men familiar with the Mystery cults. It is also true that Irenæus speaks of the 'medicine of immortality,' though this may be reasonably enough explained by his fondness for metaphor and his dependence upon Johannine thought. But Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a people to whom the idea of the eating of the God would have been at once inconceivable and abhorrent ; and to associate that great heir of Jewish tradition with such magical conceptions is impossible.

Ultimately the thing that matters most is what Jesus meant when He pronounced the words, 'This is my body.' Were it not for the reverence paid in general to the exact words of Scripture and in particular to the words of Christ, it would seem initially incredible that these words should ever have been taken in their literal sense. For one thing, Jesus was there in bodily presence before the disciples when these words were uttered : it would seem, therefore, irrational to the point of absurdity to regard the bread as also and literally His body. Besides, Jesus, like all Orientals, was in the habit of speaking in figurative language—'without a parable spake he nothing unto them' (Mt 13<sup>34</sup>). Nobody in his senses takes Him literally when He claims to be the Vine and the Door. This is the point that Zwingli urged against Luther at the famous conference in 1529 in the Marburg Schloss, and Luther's obstinate insistence, so inexplicable in a man of his poetic temperament, on 'Hoc est corpus meum,' may be said, in a sense, to have wrecked the unity of the Reformation. We do not exactly like the rendering of a well-known modern translation, 'This means my body broken for you,'

but in view of the circumstances of the case and the Oriental fondness for imagery, there can be little question that that is the true interpretation and that Jesus means no more—and no less—than the words than that the bread and the wine are symbols which represent Himself as the source of life for all believers.

From that point of view the doctrine of Transubstantiation can only be regarded as a pathetic and irrational perversion of the truth, and it is a comfort to remember, as Mr. SIMPSON points out, that the first known use of the word in connexion with the Eucharist does not occur till the twelfth century and that the doctrine was not expressly taught till the thirteenth. Utterances of the first and second centuries which have been held to point in the direction of a real change in the elements—whether that change is regarded as occurring at the breaking of the bread, the utterance of the words, 'This is my body,' or the invocation of the Holy Spirit—really mean only that the bread and the wine, which remain what they were, are now invested with heavenly significance.

Mr. SIMPSON does well to emphasize the fact that Protestants believe as earnestly as 'Catholics' in the Real Presence, and are as keenly conscious of the Presence in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. To them Christ is assuredly present there as He is present in all experience of the Holy Spirit wherever He manifests Himself. Considering the sublime suggestiveness of the circumstances attending the Supper, which focuses, as it were, in one shining point, the great Christian doctrines of Incarnation, Atonement, and Immortality, they would even admit that that Presence may become more real there than at other times and places, and that the Supper is 'specially effective in drawing Christians into the presence of their Lord.'

It is in line with this view of the Sacrament that Mr. SIMPSON argues earnestly for an ethical religion opposed to a magical sacramentalism. For the early period 'the celebration in itself is regarded as of no value apart from the moral and spiritual condition of those who take part.' Again, 'the atmosphere

sphere of the early Eucharist is an atmosphere of prayer and penitence and the relationship thus experienced between the believers and their Lord is fundamentally moral.' And Christian writers of different schools all down the centuries agree that the Lord's Supper has no actual sanctifying power apart from the spiritual condition of the participants. Apart from the subjective faith and disposition of the believer, the objective reality comes to be a meaningless abstraction.' This is a point to be pressed vigorously home against the superstition that the Sacraments are effective *ex parte operato*.

Other controversial points of scarcely less interest and importance, such as Reservation, are touched upon in this scholarly and useful book. The centrality of the Lord's Supper for Christian faith and practice is so widely conceded that any competent attempt to interpret it in its original setting, and to set forth its implications for the modern Church deserves to be carefully considered by all who have the welfare of the Christian faith and the Christian Church at heart; and this gives special timeliness to Mr. SIMPSON's discussion.

*The Eternal Values* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net) is the general subject of the fifth series of Riddell Memorial Lectures delivered before the University of Durham at Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne, by the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. The lectures are two in number, the first treating of 'The Idea of Value,' and the second of 'God and the World.' In the first is justified the time-honoured and absolute pre-eminence of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. In the second is vindicated the transcendence of God, which is consciously or unconsciously rejected by some of our modern idealists.

In this second lecture there is a rapid review of the traditional or classical arguments for the existence of God, and our readers may be interested to learn how those arguments fare at the hands of so acute and vigorous a thinker as Dean INGE.

In his opinion the ontological argument possesses real cogency. But it should not be presented in its awkward scholastic form, as in Anselm and Descartes. Here is the form in which it commends itself to Dean INGE. 'We have an immediate apprehension of the intrinsic values of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. This apprehension is something which is given to us; it cannot be reduced to, or derived from, anything else. It is as much part of our mental furniture as the concepts based on sense-perception. Is it conceivable that all this aspect of the world as we know it is void of actuality? Is it all merely subjective, and homeless in the real universe? . . . But these three values are to the religious mind attributes of God, and they are not independent of each other. In proportion as we make them our own, they appear as revelations of one supreme Mind—that which we call God.'

The ontological argument, as thus presented, does not claim that the knowledge of God's existence is given intuitively, so that no doubt can be felt about it, but rather that it is the result of a valid inference from the appreciation of the Good, the True, and the Beautiful.

The cosmological argument, or proof *a contingencia mundi*, does not amount to much more than this—that the existence of the contingent presupposes a necessary ground. But this does not lead to a single real Being. Nor is it beyond question that the world is contingent. If God is infinite, eternal, and necessary, those predicates may also apply to the world.

The teleological argument is also very vulnerable. There is no way of proving that all things are directed by a beneficent design. What connexion is there between our globe and other abodes of life, a million light-years away, and billions of years sundered in time? Further, if God lives His own life exempt from the vicissitudes of time and change, why should He not have many purposes? 'Divine guidance must be postulated,' as Arthur Balfour said, 'if we are to maintain the three great values, knowledge, love, and beauty'; but Dean

INGE regards this as rather the conclusion of the ontological argument, restated as he has suggested.

It seems to us, however, that, while Dean INGE claims to have restated the ontological argument, he has actually transformed it. He presents it not as an *a priori*, but as an *a posteriori*, argument, and as an enlarged form of Kant's moral argument, if freed from the limitations of the critical philosophy.

In Professor J. F. MC FADYEN'S new book, *The Message of the Parables* (reviewed elsewhere), we have a fine example of the realistic type of exposition. Take as an example the Parable of the Sower. It is easy to see why this Parable occupies a position of such prominence in the gospel record. It deals with the unresponsiveness of people to the Christian message. And one of the great problems of the early Church was the rejection of Jesus by His own people. If Jesus was indeed the King of the Jews, and it was His claim to be so that was the legal pretext for His crucifixion, why did not His natural subjects acknowledge His sovereignty? The preaching of the early chapters of Acts emphasizes that the moral responsibility for the death of Jesus rested not with the Romans, but with His own countrymen (2<sup>23</sup> 3<sup>13</sup>). When the missionaries were dealing with the Gentiles the question was pertinent: 'If you claim that Jesus was the fulfilment of the Jewish scriptures, why did the Jews have Him put to death?'

The Sower must have made a strong appeal to the first evangelists in another way. Fresh from the experience of Pentecost, they felt the powers of the unseen world pulsing within them. Like the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, they had been crippled, by sin and doubt, by fear and diffidence; and now all that was gone, their shackles broken, their fears forgotten. For the first time they could stand on their own feet, and walk and leap and praise God. It was inconceivable, they felt, that to a message like theirs from men who had come face to face with the Divine, people would not listen. And it is clear even from Acts (which dwells more on their successes than their failures) that

what they actually met with was largely indifference or even actual hostility.

Jesus had the same experience. It is clear, for example, that in the capital His movement made little headway, and (what is more surprising) that even in towns of Galilee, like Bethsaida, Nazareth, Chorazin, Capernaum, He met definite rejection. And the Christian preacher has the same experience to-day. It may be prejudice, as Paul found at Athens, where Greek absorption in philosophical speculation made the gospel seem absurd, or in Jewish quarters where Jewish preconception revolted against the thought of a crucified Messiah. In our day a knowledge of the supposed teaching of science closes many a mind to the message of Jesus. On the other hand, it may be the more demands of Jesus, or worldliness, or the competition of other interests. The modern forms of the barriers to Christ are not difficult to mention.

But there is something more, though the gospel writers do not go any farther. We want more than an analysis, however skilful, of the causes of our failure. Whatever may be said of the spiritual problem, at least the farmer's problem was capable of solution. If he wanted grain to grow on his land, all he had to do was to plough it. If his patches the ground was too shallow, more earth could be brought or the stones could be taken out. If thorns are choking the grain, they can be weeded away. In other words, by a course of preparation unproductive soil can be made fertile. What is the counterpart of this in the spiritual world? The attitude of men to the things of the spirit depends not only on their nature and their voluntary choices, but also on their experience and environment. Poverty, oppression, lower contacts, a struggle to live, physical pain, failure of ambition, these and much else may make men indifferent to any spiritual appeal. What are we to say of the way to soften hard hearts or give depth to superficial hearts?

One lesson of the Sower is that, for multitude preaching does not by itself provide a pathway to the Kingdom. Our Lord's healing ministry to the distressed in body or in mind, His invitations to the

to help the poor, His attempts to free the people from the intolerable burdens imposed on them by the religious lawyers, His efforts to open the eyes of the Pharisees to the true nature of their religious code, were all by way of preparation, of ploughing and removing stones and weeds. In the West, until lately and in a measure still, in dealing with those sections of the population that seem to feel the least need of the Church and all that the Church stands for, we have gone on mechanically offering them a gospel which obviously means nothing to the vast majority of them ; often sending to them our youngest and least experienced workers, imperfectly trained and with little equipment of any kind.

We have at last learned that souls are not to be captured with less ingenuity than any other object in the chase, and that in His work God wants the diction of brain as well as heart. The varieties of social and educational activities that now accompany our evangelistic efforts are a recognition of the fact that the soil counts for something as well as the seed. But the Church alone can never plough up all the hard ground, can never root out all the thorns that choke the growth of all good. It needs the Church and the State and the School working together ; and perhaps God alone, through the experience of life, can give depth to the shallow soul.

One striking illustration of this lesson is found in the mission field, where the crust of age-long superstition, pride, contempt, and unbrotherliness has to be broken down before the seed can enter in with any hope of bearing fruit. Here, too, are thorns of neglect, poverty, arrogant wealth, painful and often deathsome disease, ignorance, fear, class and national conceit. Hence the varieties of mission work that sometimes puzzle so much the observer at home ; the hospitals and dispensaries, the schools and colleges, the homes and hostels, the training schools, industrial institutions and printing presses, the co-operative societies and farm colonies. This preparatory stage may continue for generations before the gospel gets an opportunity to show its power.

This Parable is a piece of splendid optimism. Where there is failure, it is failure of a kind which can be traced to its sources and dealt with. But when the seed falls on suitable soil that has been carefully prepared and protected from hostile influences, God sends fruit out of all proportion to the seed that has been sown or the labour that has been expended.

---

Wilfred Monod's profound and beautiful little book on *Silence and Prayer* (Allenson ; 2s. 6d. net) has been fittingly translated by Gladys A. SLADE, and will be found a rich storehouse of devotion. Several of the meditations deal very helpfully with Prayer and the Will of God.

---

In prayer there must, first of all, be a definite act of consecration to the will of God. ' In the morning, rising up a great while before day, Jesus went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed.' Each of His days started with the establishing of an ineffable communion between the Only Son and His Heavenly Father. ' The same religious experience is allowed to us. If we kneel in the morning to acquiesce in life, then the valiant and sincere acceptance of existence will awaken our sympathy for men, our brothers subject to the same conditions, and we will unite with humanity by an inward act. And this union with humanity will put us in contact with Christ, and Christ will lead us towards God. When we have reached this point, our prayer has touched the goal. We breathe the air from the heights. Now, we are ready for the day's work ; a mysterious voice assures us of it ; a pure force animates us ; we are in harmony with life, with men, with the Messiah, and with God. We can go forward.' In this act of consecration we consent not only to be useful, but to be utilized. We offer ourselves, saying in spirit, Here am I, send me. ' I long to work at the establishing of Thy Kingdom in the house where I dwell, at my family fireside. I make an act of love faithful and holy for those Thou hast given me to love, and to serve by love. May I irradiate to-day in my home. . . . I long to work at the establishing of Thy Kingdom in the wide world. I make an act of solemn joy, in provision

of the labours, the struggles, and the revelations of the day. This evening I will possess truths which I ignored this morning ; I will have brought this evening my stone to the building of the future City.'

But often the way is not clear. The will of God is veiled. We come to a parting of the ways where we are in perplexity, knowing not which to choose, but recognizing that the choice is a momentous one. 'Whether it concerns a marriage, a business transaction, the choice of a career, or a change of residence, or a resolution which will influence deeply the education of our children, we hesitate. The impenetrable future is contained in the present minute, and this appears to us like the fatal die which a feverish hand throws at random on some gaming table.' Why this darkness, this silence of our Heavenly Father, when our one desire is to know and do His will ? This question raises the whole problem of prayer, the whole mystery of God's relation to the world. All the great saints have wrestled with it, and in wrestling have strengthened their faith. 'Moses, Elijah, Jeremiah, and John the Baptist have tasted the bitterness of this mystery ; and our Saviour, searching with anguish the will of the Father, sweated blood in the garden of Gethsemane. But has He gone down, for that, in the whirlpool of chance, in the abyss of nothingness ? No, He has refused tenaciously to give way to despair. He has terminated His life on a victorious finale, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit." Such is the atmosphere of heroism and serenity in which we must settle to search the will of God concerning us.'

Having thus settled the principle, we must come down to applications. Standing at the cross-roads, we must carefully scan the signposts for guidance as to the right direction. And here are some of them.

To begin with, we may take it that in every case the will of God regarding us is in accordance with the laws of Nature and reason, unless the contrary be proved. We need not expect the wise and necessary laws of Providence to be held in abeyance for our benefit. 'There are, however, careless,

blind, and obstinate ones who delude themselves on this point. They will choose lodgings in defiance of all rules of hygiene ; they will let their children run about scorning elementary prudence ; they will decide upon a marriage of which the moral and physical consequences can only be disastrous ; they will rush into an enterprise where a sure check is certain, according to all rules of arithmetic and simple common sense, and each time they will expect a benediction from on High ! . . . On principle, the will of God is reasonable.'

The second guiding principle arises out of the fact that the world in which we live is not only the domain of Nature, but is also the realm of grace and redemption. It follows from this that the will of God regarding us must conform to the moral ideal which shines in the Bible. At the heart of that ideal is the Cross, and the will of God for us must ever move in line with it. 'If, in the darkness of a painful perplexity, we choose the line of conduct which leads to Calvary, our reason does not abdicate its right ; but it puts consciously its power to the service of holiness and brotherly love ; it disappears without being annihilated, in the glory of the splendour, like the metallic wire heated to a white heat in the globe of an electric lamp.'

This does not mean, however, that between two ways, the rougher or the more repellent is always the way of duty. The problem of right living cannot be solved by any such hard-and-fast rule. 'Duty is, sometimes, to abandon renouncement, not to give way to the attraction of risk and adventure. Duty is, often, to attend to the nearest work, to devote oneself to the task of the day, now in one's family, now in one's calling. So we escape the stinging criticism expressed in these terms by a thoughtful Christian, "It is easier for some persons to be sublime than to be honest." ' A prepared formula, however seemingly sublime, is not adequate to the complexity of life. We need guidance of a more intimate and personal kind, such as can only come when we constantly assume an inward attitude of intelligent and free submission. For 'communication with God is the spring air where the bud of moral certitude can appear, burst forth, and bloom.'

Having thus prayed and patiently waited for the ght, having pondered the circumstances, and conrmed to the rules of reason and the gospel, we lay confidently expect the Divine guidance. Sometimes it is a flash of lightning which sets on re the horizon ; sometimes it is the pale and less glimmer of the dawn. But always, in our inner being, a solemn voice rises and cries, " Every ne that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh deth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." It is a conviction so deep, so personal, that it remains incommunicable ; but nothing can shake

When such a decision has been prayerfully reached we are not to suffer ourselves to be troubled y vain regrets, even should something painful and nexpected follow. It is idle to picture to ourselves what might have been. 'To choose one of the ways of the cross-roads is to give up the other ;

and, from then, we are always free to picture to ourselves that it led to marvellous sights, of which we are deprived for ever.' But to return thus upon the past is inconsistent with moral health, and with the strong assurance that, in acting as we did, we obeyed a supernatural impulse of the Holy Spirit.

Even if an error is proved to have been made, error is in no wise fatal. Bewildered at the cross-roads, we have perhaps taken a false direction, and now we cannot go back. Something irreparable has been done. But that is no reason for despair, but only another reason for committing ourselves afresh to God. 'Our last refuge in all circumstances, and whatever may happen, will be faith. Do not let ourselves be paralysed by brutal reality ; failure of family life, poor health, lost position, mediocre earnings, wasted youth, sacrificed reputation, friends far away, vanished illusions, graves dug. To believe in God is to deny the irreparable.'

## The Question of Authority in Religion.

BY PROFESSOR C. J. WRIGHT, B.D., PH.D., DIDSBURY COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

HE final question in the great theological debate now proceeding in all Christian countries is that of Authority. This is perceived by those who penetrate beneath the surface of religious differences or disagreements. The really important question is not so much the specific articles of our creed, but the grounds on which that creed rests. It frequently happens that when Christian leaders of differing theological or ecclesiastical traditions come together to discuss their views in order to reach some kind of unification or *rapprochement*, they are gratified at first by the measure of agreement in their beliefs. But a deep gulf manifests itself when some issue touching the fundamental question of Authority arises. It is then perceived that the deepest division is not between those who differ in the articles of their belief, but between those who differ on the Reason or Basis of belief.

Take, for example, the following statement from Milton. 'A man,' he says, 'may be a heretic in the truth, and if he believe things only because his pastor says so, or the assembly so determines,

without knowing other reason, though his belief be true, yet the very truth he holds becomes his heresy.' In other words, the real heretic is the man who believes for the wrong reasons, not the man who assents to the wrong beliefs. Now it is obvious that this is not the view most people take of heresy. To the Roman Catholic the supreme heresy is manifest in the attitude of Milton whose words I have quoted. The first principle of 'Catholicism' is that you must believe what the Church—that is, the Roman Church—tells you to believe.

Ours not to reason why,  
Ours but to do and die.

Absolute submission of the mind to the dogmatic teaching of the Church is the virtue of virtues ; it is, indeed, 'the one thing needful.' Rome represents not so much a *credo* as an *impero*. The heresy of heresies is disobedience. I do not suggest that the Roman Church is the only body of men which holds to this conception

of heresy. Most of the Protestant Churches have in the past held to the same conception, the only difference being as to the *seat* of this 'authority' which by its very nature *imposes itself* upon the human mind. The two 'infallibilities' of Catholicism were replaced in Scholastic Protestantism by one 'infallibility'—that is, the 'infallibility' of the Church was surrendered, but the 'infallibility' of the Bible was retained. But fundamentally the same conception of heresy remains. The heretic in this case, as in the former, is he who assents to the wrong beliefs, or withholds assent from the right beliefs; and the rightness or wrongness of beliefs is determined in both instances by an 'external authority,' to which, it is declared, assent *must* be given.

Now it is just this acquiescent and unenlightened submission of the mind that Milton would call 'heresy.' That is, it is not something to be esteemed, it is something to be reprobated.

Now, if we reflect upon these differences of viewpoint, we shall see that it is necessary to make a distinction that is frequently overlooked. We must, that is, distinguish between what we may call '*a truth*' and what we may call '*truth*.' When we speak about '*a truth*' we are thinking of a statement which is in accord with reality. If a statement is in accord with reality it is '*true*,' irrespective of whether we believe it or do not believe it, irrespective, also, of the reasons why we believe it or do not believe it. Let us take, for example, a statement in the realm of physical reality—light travels at the rate of 186,000 miles a second. Now the '*truth*' of that statement does not depend on whether we give assent to it or no. It is either '*a truth*' or it is not a truth; it is either, that is, in accord with fact or it is not in accord with fact. But, on the other hand, we frequently speak of '*truth*' when we mean an attitude of mind, or an ethical quality. I take the following utterance of the Psalmist to illustrate this ethical usage: 'Thou desirest *truth* in the inward parts.' Obviously the Psalmist is not thinking of truth in either the scientific or in the philosophic sense; he is thinking of an attitude of heart or of mind. In other words, he is thinking of what we call '*truthfulness*'.

Now we can be truthful without having either the knowledge of the scientists or the '*wisdom*' of the philosophers. Indeed, we may be fundamentally untruthful even if we have both the one and the other. This is, no doubt, what the Victorian scientist, Huxley, meant when he said that 'clever men were as common as blackberries,

the rare thing is to find a good one.' You may believe correctly and have no '*truth*' in you; you may believe incorrectly and yet have '*truth*' within. That is why we love '*truthful*' people even if we firmly reject their beliefs or opinion. It was this ethical quality of truthfulness that the Scottish poet Burns had in mind when he said:

The heart aye's the part aye  
That mak's us right or wrang.

In order to disentangle the confusions that arise when we talk about 'authority' in religion let us confront the question: Is Christianity concerned with '*truths*' or with '*truth*'? In other words, with doctrines which are held to be in accord with ultimate reality, or with an ethical attitude of heart and of mind? Obviously, we would say, it is concerned with both. Let us take the latter point first.

No one can read the Gospels without perceiving that Christianity as taught, and incarnated, by our Lord is essentially a matter of inner spirit or motive. A man, says Ruskin, is known to his dog by his scent, to his tailor by his clothes, to his friend by his smile. The smile that illuminates the face reveals the spirit within. And it is a man's '*spirit*' which, in the eyes of Jesus, is the criterion of his religion. 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' Many of '*the righteous*' shall in the Great Judgment day, according to the searching parable of Jesus, find themselves approved when they did not remember to have acknowledged or recognized Him in speech or formal belief. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me.' And, on the other hand, those who did not remember ever to have passed Him by find themselves among the '*goats*.' 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me.' In the Gospels the test of real religion is never submission to external authority or conformity to ceremonial or precept. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' Nothing entering into a man defiles a man. It is '*out of the heart*' that proceed both everything that can be called good and everything that can be called evil. The main concern of our Lord in His teaching was not to add to the stock of men's information, but to kindle the insight of their own souls and to elicit a personal obedience to the principles that guided His own life. For that reason, we are told, He taught in parables so that people should see with their own eyes.

not at all. He did not enunciate dogmatic formulas or rules of behaviour. To believe and do what you are told was not the way to life. There was a pearl of great price, but it had to be sought for diligently and sacrificially before it could be found. He Himself was not concerned to write down anything for the facile and fallacious solution of the later problems of His followers. His aim was not to add to the number of 'authorities' to which the future could turn as a codified past. In this He differed from 'the scribes' of all the ages and of all the races. The people who heard and saw Him recognized the difference when they said of Him, *not* He taught *from authorities*, but He taught *with authority*. They recognized, in other words, that here was one whose life was intrinsically authoritative, whose teaching had upon it the self-evidencing stamp of truth.

It is undeniable that this was the *emphasis* of the life and teaching of Jesus. I do not suggest that others may not have *whispered* occasional aggments of all this; but it was His to *proclaim* consistently and consistently this new world of religion. A man's *emphasis* is the man himself.

The truest of His followers are those who have caught that spirit and that emphasis. The nineteenth chapter of First Corinthians shows how deeply Paul had drunk from that fountain. It is possible to be a great preacher, an eminent philanthropist, even a martyr for the faith, and yet to be without the one thing needful. Limitations of space forbid my illustrating further what must be obvious to all.

Christianity, therefore, is concerned supremely with 'truth,' in the sense of a personal ethical attitude and a personal spiritual insight.

But it will be obvious to the reflecting mind that 'Christianity' is more than this. What we call 'Christianity' may be viewed subjectively or objectively. In other words, it may be viewed *from the inside*, or *from the outside*. The former method of approach represents the presupposition that we are only in a position to talk about the Christian religion in so far as we have personal experience of it. This is the realm of what is called 'personal salvation.' There is, however, another realm with which theology and philosophy are concerned. To the Christian theologian or Christian philosopher, 'Christianity' stands for a body of 'truths.' It is bound up with 'doctrines' which are to be regarded, it is maintained, as objectively true—doctrines about the being and nature of God, about the Person of Jesus Christ,

about the meaning and destiny of human life. If these doctrines are true, their truth stands irrespective of whether individual Christians have the ethical truthfulness and spiritual insight such as are comprehended in what we call a 'Christian experience.' This means that Christianity is bound up not only with the question of the 'authority' of one's personal religious attitude, but with the question of Authority.

It will have already been noted that the word 'authority' is used in various senses, and it is the confusion arising from this ambiguity that stultifies many of the discussions on the question of Authority in Religion. And what I wish here to point out is that the word involves not only a *relative* notion, but also an *absolute* notion. It leads us to think not only of one's own attitude or assent, but of that towards which one's mind assents or is directed. It leads us, further, to think not simply of that which *in point of fact* commands assent or secures obedience, but that which has the *absolute right* so to do. It suggests to us not merely an utterance or an institution which, on various grounds, psychological and historical, is able to coerce the beliefs or secure the submission of men, but that which, apart from all pragmatic or utilitarian considerations, *is true*. We may, is it not obvious, claim 'authority' and exercise 'authority,' without having any *Authority* to claim or to exercise. When Shakespeare spoke of

proud man,  
Drest in a little brief authority,  
Most ignorant of what he's most assur'd

he was using the word in the *relative* sense. Yet the very fact that we smile as we read his words shows that we are contrasting our proud man dressed in his little brief authority with a conception of *absolute* Authority deeply seated in the mind. Over against the 'little brief authority' stands the *absolute* Authority of Truth.

Inasmuch, therefore, as Christianity involves affirmations about the meaning of existence which are held to be *true*, it is impossible to acquiesce in the distinction which is now so frequently made between 'a religion of Authority' and 'a religion of the Spirit.' The distinction is often made in order to suggest that we can have the latter without the former. The contrast is, however, a false one, if it suggests that any Christian can be unconcerned with the question of the Truth of Christianity. The distinction really should be, not between 'a religion of the Spirit' and 'a religion of Authority,' but between *religion* and

a religion. Religion is a man's whole mental, moral, and spiritual attitude to life: it is necessarily, as Christ taught us, 'of the Spirit.' A religion, on the other hand, involves statements about ultimate reality: it is necessarily, therefore, concerned with Authority, in the sense, that is, of Truth.

I have referred earlier in this paper to the life and teaching of Jesus which reveal to us what religion really is. But let it not be thought that Jesus was not concerned with Truth. He was, for example, always speaking to men about God, and what He said about God He held to be true. The profoundest theological and metaphysical teaching is found on every page of the Evangelical narratives. All His ethical teaching rests upon, and is involved in, His theological teaching. It is often stated to-day that what is called 'the sermon on the mount' is concerned not with theology but with practical, ethical issues; and the suggestion is frequently added that a modern Christian can get along very well without any theological beliefs. It is overlooked that the whole sermon is founded upon our Lord's teaching about God. In the Beatitudes He does not tell men that they will find temporal *happiness* in following His way of life; He says that thus they will find eternal *blessedness*. The perfection they must seek after is the perfection which belongs to God Himself. 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.'

The Christianity found in the Gospels, therefore, is not only a 'way of life'; it is a creed about God and the meaning of existence. If we emphasize the first, we must not overlook the second. It is a false antithesis to place one against the other. But such is the frailty of the human mind that if a man affirms, and rightly affirms, that Christianity is a 'way of life,' he frequently implies that it doesn't matter what he believes; and if he declares, and rightly declares, that Christianity stands or falls with certain theological or metaphysical beliefs, he frequently forgets that one can be as 'orthodox' as the devil, and as wicked. Samuel Butler in *The Way of all Flesh* speaks of certain early nineteenth-century Christians who were as horrified at hearing Christianity doubted as at seeing it practised. To-day the danger in certain quarters is that Christians should sceptically evacuate their religion of doctrinal or theological basis. Such need the reminder of one who did not accept the Christian creed. Speaking of metaphysical beliefs the late Dr. McTaggart said: 'It will depend on them whether we can regard the troubles of the present, and the uncertainties

of the future, with the feelings of a mouse toward a cat, or of a child towards its father.'

If I have carried my readers with me thus far they will see that since, as I have maintained, Christianity stands for the absolute Authority of Truth itself, the final question is, What precisely are these truths for which Christianity stands and, further, How can we know them to be true?

The first part of the question is, What is the essential content of Christianity? One of the chief troubles of the Church of Christ confronts a perplexed, and sometimes sceptical, world that she is not agreed as to the answer to this all important question. Church differs from Church and theological system differs from theological system. Every student of Church history knows that the first great ecclesiastical division of Christianity, that into the Eastern and Western Church, involved disagreement as to the truth for which Christianity stands. And the Protestant Reformation involved a much greater disagreement than the earlier division as to this essential nature of Christianity itself.

Essential Protestantism, with which we are here concerned, declares that the essence of Christianity is the gospel of the Grace of God in Jesus Christ. This is the 'Evangelical' emphasis, as opposed to the 'Catholic' emphasis. The central content of the Christian revelation is set forth in the Pauline word: 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.' This gospel message is the criterion by which we test the two 'infallibilities' of Catholic Scholasticism, and the one 'infallibility' of Protestant Scholasticism. When we apply the gospel criterion to Tradition and Dogma in the Church, we must repudiate every 'development' which is not in harmony with this essential message. When we apply this same gospel criterion to the books which compose our Bible, we are compelled to relinquish the notion of a homogeneous block of mechanically inspired, inerrant history and science. The gospel of the Grace of God in Christ tests both Bible and Church. Thus we see that the abiding value of the Bible is that it enshrines and communicates a progressive revelation which reaches its culmination in Jesus Christ, the very 'Word of God,' as St. John calls Him, 'the image of the invisible God,' as St. Paul calls Him, 'the effulgence of God's glory, the express image of his substance,' as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls Him. Thus, also, we see that the abiding value of the visible Church is not itself, but in the gospel which is its very *raison d'être*: in other words, in its fidelity to this revealed

on of God in Christ, and in its capacity for inspiring in successive generations the whole rich, evangelical experience of the New Testament.

This essential gospel of Christianity involves, obviously, certain great doctrinal affirmations. These affirmations must not be equated with the many tortuous, speculative constructions with which the student of theology is familiar. There is urgent need to-day of what we may call the 'implification' of doctrinal statement, and such implication need not involve impoverishment.

It is the task of distinguishing the essential from the unessential. In every age there is, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would remind us, a 'removing of the things that can be shaken,' but this should be, only in order that 'the things which cannot be shaken' may stand forth in clearer and grander light. To the present writer the substance of the Christian revelation is found in three great affirmations—**GOD**, the **INCARNATION**, and **ETERNAL LIFE**.

The second part of the question is, How is the essential truth of Christianity to be known? How, in other words, is it authenticated?

In the last analysis, the truth of Christianity, like the truth of anything else, must be its own evidence. The final evidence, for example, of the statement that light travels at the rate of 186,000 miles a second is in the phenomenon itself. The statement is not true because the astronomers say so: the astronomers say so because it is true. Some one may demur to this by saying that multitudes of people assent to the statement when they have not personally verified it. Even so, the truth of the statement rests in the fact itself, which lies open to the verification of every one who will properly inquire. The truth of any statement lies in the reality about which it is a statement; it never merely rests upon the testimony of those who make the statement. And every assent to truth presupposes a nature belonging to man in which is implanted the possibility of *recognizing* it when he sees it.

Whoever, then, speaks of the *truth* of Christianity implicitly declares, whether he knows it or not, that the only authority for Christianity is in Christianity itself. To deny this is to lapse into fundamental scepticism; and this fundamental scepticism is latent in the position of those who say that dogmas are true because Church or Book says so. Whatever truth is in Church or Book is in the reality which they express or communicate.

For that reason those who believe in the truth of Christianity never fear inquiry. To interdict

inquiry is to manifest a deeper and more desolating scepticism than to hold sceptical opinions.

Nothing that keeps thought out is safe from thought. For there's no virgin-fort but self-respect, And truth defensive hath lost hold on God.

It is now nearly three centuries since Milton, to whom I may be permitted to refer again, writing 'to all the Churches of Christ,' said: 'I earnestly beseech all lovers of truth, not to cry out that the Church is thrown into confusion by that freedom of discussion and inquiry which is granted to the schools, and ought certainly to be refused to no believer, since we are ordered "to prove all things," and since the daily progress of the light of truth is productive far less of disturbance to the Church than of illumination and edification.' The words are as appropriate to-day as then; they were indeed never more necessary than in an age when so much new light is breaking forth from the whole universe environing us. If the new light bewilders and blinds us for a time, let us not turn our eyes from it and grope back to the delusive refuge of 'external authorities.' What Sir Philip Sidney said of 'fear' is surely most true of this 'fear of truth.'

Fear is more paine than is the paine it fears,  
Disarming human minds of native might.

It is no true function of the Church, therefore, to commandeer a submissive assent or to proscribe inquiry. Her real function is pedagogic. Like all good schoolmasters, her task is to win her pupils to that enlightened assent which comes when the truth evidences itself in personal conviction. Her ministers preach the truths of Christianity as they see it and know it, and they expect their message to prevail, not because *they* declare it, but because they believe that, adequately proclaimed, Divine Truth will win its own way in the hearts and minds of men. Often, like the good schoolmaster again, they will be perplexed to know just what to say and what not to say, or when to speak and when to be silent. Then they will take counsel with the saints and seers of the past and of the present through whom the Word of God has been transmitted to them. And the central truths of the Christian Faith which have authenticated themselves in their own lives they will seek to interpret to others. In all this their faith will be that the Divine Spirit will authenticate the Divine Word within the depths of the human soul. What else is the doctrine of the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti* but the religious side of the philosophical doctrine of the self-evidencing nature of Truth?

# Modern Witnesses to the Value of Authority in Religion.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., ILFORD.

THE present century exhibits a widespread reaction against the principle of Authority in Religion. The whole conception is most unpopular. And for that very reason it requires to be reconsidered. Popularity is not the test of Truth. Nor is a state of Reaction likely to secure an accurately balanced estimate of principles. Reflections of this kind have led a number of thoughtful modern writers to impress upon us the value of this unpopular principle from which so many have reacted. It seems desirable, in the interests of impartiality, that some of their reflections on behalf of Authority in Religion should be grouped together.

Arranging the witnesses more or less in chronological order, the first place may be assigned to the eminent Unitarian teacher, Dr. Martineau.

Dealing with the principle of an Authority external to the individual, Martineau observed that 'two claims are preferred to this exceptional position,—one by Catholics on behalf of "the Church"; the other by Protestants on behalf of "the Bible." They agree in assigning to something outward an authority before which the inward protest of even our highest faculties must sink in silence: they differ in attributing this authority to a *corporation* in the one case, to a literature in the other. In the latter case, the Holy Spirit, having once created the books of Scripture, remains, as it were, stereotyped there, and liable to all the disadvantages which Plato charges upon written language,—that, though you would think the page alive with the thoughts it has, it looks up at you always with the same face; is dumb to the questions you ask; and, if tossed about in contumely or mistake, cannot defend itself, but needs its father to help it. In the former case, the Holy Spirit perpetuates its work by taking for its organ an ever-living hierarchy, which is there to speak in every age, to interpret and supplement the dubious text, to correct the aberrations of reason, and relieve the perplexities of conscience.'<sup>1</sup>

If neither the hierarchy nor the canon can make good a claim to dictatorial authority, it by no means follows that the sacred function ascribed

to them is gone, and that nothing divine is committed to their keeping. It may well be true that, for the religious guidance of men, there is a real order of dependence of the multitude upon the few, and of ordinary ages upon special crises and transmitted products of fresh spiritual insight, though the relation has degenerated into servility. But the oscillations of unreasoning impulse always shoot past the true centre without a pause. The easy credulity of mankind first insists on investing the priest with magical powers, and then, on discovery of their failure, turns upon him fiercely as an imposter. The blind idolater of "Holy Writ" will have it all infallible, that it may spare him the cares of thought and conscience, . . . and then, when his moral sense has outgrown the Israelitish standard, and with his critical discernment he finds himself in the midst of myth and legend, of *vaticinia post eventum*, of conflicting histories and incompatible doctrines, he vents his displeasure, not upon his own arbitrary expectations, but on the written text which was in no way bound to fulfil them, and the persons whom he had himself arrayed in hieratic robes, and now disclaims as mortals in working dress. Thus he stipulate for everything or nothing, and fling away whatever is short of all your fancied need, is the mere waywardness of the spoilt child: it is to demand absolutely at variance with the mixed conditions of any possible communion between perfect and imperfect natures. Not heaven itself can pour more or purer spiritual gifts into you than your immediate capacity can hold; and if the Holy Spirit is to "lead you into *all truth*," it will not be by saving you the trouble of parting right from wrong, but by the even keener severance of the evil from the good through the strenuous working of a quickened mind.'<sup>2</sup>

The next place may fairly be assigned to Lord Balfour. His analysis of *The Foundations of Belief*, published in 1895, is largely concerned with the relation between Authority and Reason in Religion. The startling emphasis laid by him upon Authority has been immensely provocative of discussion, and is of undeniable importance in the matured conclusion of a Scottish Metaphysician.

<sup>1</sup> *J. Martineau, The Seat of Authority in Religion, 129 f.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid. 287 f.*

imately familiar with the tendencies of modern thought, and of extensive practical experience in the requirements of human nature.

Lord Balfour says that 'to Reason is largely the growth of new and the sifting of old knowledge; the ordering, and in part the discovery, that vast body of systematised conclusions which constitute so large a portion of scientific, philosophical, ethical, political, and theological learning.'<sup>1</sup> 'When we turn, however, from the conscious work of Reason to that which is unconsciously performed for us by Authority, a very different spectacle arrests our attention. The effects of the first, prominent as they are through the dignity of their origin, are trifling compared with the all-pervading influences which flow from the second. In every moment of our lives, as individuals, as members of a family, of a party, of a nation, of a church, of a universal brotherhood, the silent, continuous, unnoticed influence of Authority moulds our feelings, our aspirations, and, what we are more immediately concerned with, our beliefs. It is from Authority that Reason itself draws its most important premises. . . . And even in those cases where we may most truly say that our beliefs are the rational product of strictly intellectual processes, we have, in all probability, only got to trace back the thread of our inferences to its beginnings in order to perceive that it finally issues itself in some general principle which, describe as we may, is in fact due to no more defensible origin than the influence of Authority. . . .

'It is true, no doubt, that we can, without any great expenditure of research, accumulate instances which Authority has perpetuated error and retarded progress; for, unluckily, none of the influences, Reason least of all, by which the history of the race has been moulded have been productive of unmixed good. . . . Yet, if we are to judge with equity between these rival claimants, we must not forget that it is Authority rather than Reason which, in the main, we owe, not religion only, but ethics and politics; that it is Authority which supplies us with essential elements in the premises of science; that it is Authority rather than Reason which lays deep the foundations of social life; that it is Authority rather than Reason which constitutes its superstructure.'

From the philosophic politician we may turn to a third writer on Authority, the Rev. Dr. Oman, who maintains that:

'The supreme religious fact is *not* the individual, but the Social, the Corporate Institution. It must

be so: for the unit in human life is not the individual. It is the family. It is not the individual as a separate unit.' . . .

'An historical Revelation is a necessity of man's position working out his freedom by finding his place amid his fellows who are called to the same high destiny.' . . .

'The search after the true Church can never cease to have a foremost place in man's endeavour. His debt to it is incalculable. Its authority in some form he must perpetually acknowledge.'<sup>2</sup>

From the head of a College at Cambridge we may advance to one of the ablest and most distinguished teachers in India—Radhakrishnan. His antecedents are Hindu; he has held the important position of King Edward's Professor of Philosophy in the University of Calcutta. His knowledge of European thought is profound, and he has given us brilliant expositions of its most recent advances in his Gifford Lectures.

On the subject of Authority he writes in his book on Idealism:

'The spiritual genius who can think out a religion for himself is one in a million.' . . .

'If we are not to languish as spiritual nomads we require a shelter.' . . .

'The importance of Authority and the value of tradition are great. If we are not to lapse into individualistic rationalism . . . if we are not to be led astray by our wandering whims, if our personal intuitions are to be guided by the accumulated wisdom of the race, only tradition can help us.'

'Mankind does not begin completely afresh with each individual. The first principles need not be proved by each of us. There is a body of accepted knowledge, a deposit of faith on which we can all draw. Though Religion is in a sense each individual's personal affair, it is dependent on past tradition and grows out of it. But loyalty to tradition is one thing, and bondage to it quite another.'

From the Hindu Professor of Philosophy in India we may go on to the writings of a distinguished Platonist in America. Elmer More requires no introduction to English students. He is deeply interested in the relation of individual reflection to social authority in Religion. It may fairly be said that individualism finds in him a congenial exponent, while at the same time he is profoundly conscious of the indispensable character of corporate authority. His final conclusion is that exclusive reliance on individual reflection is not the pathway to the full acquirement of religious Truth.

'For our growth and sanity in religion we must

<sup>1</sup> J. Oman, *Vision and Authority*.

have something to supply what the inner light will not afford to the isolated souls of men; something . . . to supply our limited intuition with the accumulated wisdom of the race, . . . some agent to set before our eyes in consecrated form the everlasting drama of the divine condescension, and to force upon our understanding the symbolism of these transient phenomena and the spiritual potencies of this material world, some organ to express our wavering faith in an abiding Creed. . . .

Thus it is that at the last religion can be neither purely individualistic nor purely determined. In one sense individualistic, yes in so far as the ultimate responsibility of choice cannot be withdrawn from the conscience of each man, whether he shall accept this dogma and this form as complying with what seems to him the verity of his own inner life, or shall reject them as expansions in a false direction; but determined also to this degree, that he will be extremely hesitant to set up his private judgment against a formulated tradition, and will prefer to abide in humble, yet not abject, submission to the Authority of a wider experience than his own.

The last of the series is D'Arcy in his very remarkable book on *The Nature of Belief*. Critics seem agreed that this book is one of the ablest that have appeared of late. We are here in a totally different atmosphere, for the writer is not only a Roman Catholic, but a Jesuit. He rests the value of Authority in Religion on two main arguments—the historic experience of the race, and the limitations of the individual being.

The majority of men have always lived under authority and taken their beliefs from others. It is their right and duty at times to question customs,

laws, authority, and beliefs, but it is certainly not normal or wholesome to question everything. There may be a few who in the full vigour of their extraordinary powers are capable of doing this; the average man and woman have neither the capacity nor the time.

The truth surely is that men are a compound strength and weakness, and so various in character and talents that it is difficult to demand of the all the same critical judgment on the questions which have troubled even the greatest intellects. We all start life with beliefs which we have learned from others, and we all need a discipline to mould our character and our thought. Nor does this cease at some adult stage. We never cease to rely on community life and to lean on good friends, to give of the one talent which may be ours and to gain by the gifts and talents of others which we do not possess ourselves. We stand on the shoulders of the past and learn to the end of our lives from the accumulated experience of mankind.

The significance of this series of works on the value of Authority in Religion is increased by the variety of their authors. The first is a German writer, the second is a Scotch philosopher, the third is the head of a Presbyterian College in the University of Cambridge, the fourth is one of the very ablest Indian thinkers of our time, the fifth is an American Platonist and exponent of Mysticism, and the last is a Jesuit. The impressive fact is that while their presuppositions differ greatly to say nothing of their individual tendencies, they all agree, from their theoretical analysis, and from their practical experience, that Authority is indispensable for the individual if he would attain possession of religious truth.

## Literature.

### MODERN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

THE Bishop of Birmingham has published his Gifford Lectures under the title of *Scientific Theory and Religion* (Cambridge University Press; 25s. net.). It is an imposing work of over seven hundred closely printed pages. The lectures cover the whole field of scientific inquiry, from physics and astronomy, up through biology and anthropology, to a consideration of the great ultimate problems

of mind, God, and immortality. To those who listened to the Lectures when delivered orally this weighty volume will come in one sense as a disappointment. For Dr. Barnes in delivering the lectures, discoursed on his theory and in a geometrical basis with great charm and in the most lucid English. But now, in the lectures as published, he has seen fit to work out the mathematics of the theory at great length, with the result that the first three hundred pages of his book are

appalling wilderness of algebraic symbols. It is safe to say that there is not one reader in a thousand who will not find these pages almost wholly unintelligible, and one fears that Dr. Barnes has launched his book with a mathematical millstone about its neck. This undue expansion of the first lectures gives to the whole work a somewhat pyramidal form. We note that Riemann's spherical geometry has received as much space as is given to the two great subjects of Man's Origin and Past, and God and our Belief in His Existence; while even Lobatchewsky's hyperbolic geometry is as fully treated as mortality.

In Physics and Astronomy, where Dr. Barnes shows an easy mastery, his treatment is marked by an admirable caution and independence of judgment, but in the realms of Biology and Anthropology there is a certain tendency to accept the theories of the standard text-books and dismiss with impatience any critical attitude towards them.

At the same time every serious student must feel that this is a monumental work, and a work of the sort that is urgently needing to be done. In these days of increasing specialism, when the departments of science are so manifold, it requires immense industry and learning and courage to attempt a synthesis. Dr. Barnes is probably as well equipped for this great task as any living man, for he brings to it a scientific mind, a comprehensive knowledge in many fields, a scrupulousness that shirks no difficulty, a wonderful power of sustained logical thinking, and a deep personal religious experience. Running through the whole work is a strong theistic argument presented with conspicuous moderation and persuasiveness, and the general conclusion reached is that 'the new knowledge of our era should not lead to scepticism or to religious indifference. Belief in God as Christ revealed Him is in no way inconsistent with acceptance of the standpoint created by modern science.'

#### AN APOLOGETIC ESSAY.

*The Finality of Jesus for Faith* (T. & T. Clark; net), by the Very Rev. Alexander Martin, D.D., LL.D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh, constitutes the thirtieth series of Cunningham Lectures. Dr. Martin is distinguished as an ecclesiastical statesman, and has borne a heavy part in the work of uniting the Church of Scotland and the former United Free Church, and in the tasks

that have ensued upon the Union. Consequently, there have been few contributions to apologetical theology from his pen in recent years. All the more welcome is the publication of these lectures, which are marked by clarity and caution, perspicacity and fair-mindedness, such as commend his expositions in the field of ecclesiastical politics.

There are six lectures in all. The first, which treats of 'The Christian Faith and Historical Relativity,' is a thoughtful contribution to the thesis that evolution cannot be applied as an exhaustive category of explanation on the level, at any rate, of human history: it may well be that in this sphere the supreme and final has in fact appeared in time.

The succeeding lectures pass from philosophy of history to New Testament exegesis. The significance of Jesus is set forth under the successive themes of Jesus the Rabbi, Jesus the Messiah-Son, the Sinless Jesus, Jesus the Saviour, and Jesus the Judge. Here follow some of the fundamental positions which Dr. Martin seeks to establish.

The ethico-religious teachings of Jesus are not His most characteristic contribution to the spiritual life of man; interwoven into their texture is the primary strain of self-reference. And what is determinative in His consciousness is the conviction that He is the fulfilment of His people's hopes, a conviction which rested on the sense of an inward relation to the Divine, of an experience and an authority belonging to Himself alone. It is because of His unique experience of an unbroken harmony with God that Jesus is the Christ; that, in other words, His personal realization of the ideal involves that there should be made thereby available for other men a power of moral self-realization for their lives also.

Dr. Martin is of opinion that an apologetic study may be content to construe Jesus in terms of the function He fulfils, needing not to enter into the problem of the nature of Him through whom so much is effected. The affirmation of Divinity thus involved may cite the authority of Melanchthon in post-Reformation times and of Ritschl in our modern age. And it may be that only by a judgment of faith is Jesus to be regarded as Divine, and that faith may here rest and be content with its own reasons, which the reason does not understand. None the less there are many who do not think that the functions which Jesus fulfils are a sufficient clue to His significance, and that Christian apologetics should pass into Christian dogmatism and make the effort to define the person of Jesus dogmatically.

## THE PARABLE.

A new book by the author of 'Jesus and Life' is sure of a welcome from the discerning. 'Jesus and Life' was a book among a thousand, quite as good, quite as original and revealing, as 'The Jesus of History.' And now Professor J. F. McFadyen, D.D., gives us *The Message of the Parables* (James Clarke ; 6s. net). The first seven chapters are of a general character, and formed the substance probably of the Bruce Lectures, out of which this book has come. They deal with the teaching methods of Jesus, Parable interpretation, and questions raised by the Parables. Then follows a series of expositions of the individual Parables. The earlier chapters are full of much needed instruction. In particular, the sixth chapter must be singled out for its suggestiveness. Dr. McFadyen points out that the Parables as we now have them are in the form they took after being used by Christian preachers for many years. This accounts for the differences, for example, in the story of the Great Supper as it appears in Matthew and as it appears in Luke. Similarly it explains the variations of the Talents from the Pounds. The point is of real importance, and this suggestion is only one instance of the freshness of mind and independence which Dr. McFadyen everywhere displays in this book. The expositions of the Parables themselves are admirable. Their chief value is the insight the writer displays into the permanent principle embodied in the story before him and the vital realism with which he translates it into the terms of our present-day life. This is a book to be cordially commended to all who would understand the mind of Jesus, and especially to those who have to reveal that mind to others.

## THE EZRA APOCALYPSE.

Modern minds are apt to pass Apocalyptic lightly by, as involving speculations too grotesquely out of touch with reality ; but no true student of the New Testament can afford to adopt this attitude, as contemporary religious thought was saturated with Apocalyptic. Of all the extant specimens of this literature the most attractive, and in many ways the noblest, is *The Ezra Apocalypse*, or 4 Ezra, or, as it is called in the English Apocrypha, the Second Book of Esdras : there are in it an earnestness, a wistfulness, a pessimism, a pathos, a magnanimity, which put it in a class by itself. It is also of considerable interest in relation to the teaching of Paul on the Law, Sin, and the Fall. An adequate treat-

ment of it, which in this country has long been overdue, has been at last furnished by Professor W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Litt.D. (Methuen ; 12s. net), whose long and arduous labours in the field of later Jewish literature peculiarly qualify him for such a task. The strictly exegetical portion, which is very thorough and amply illustrated from Apocalyptic and Rabbinic literature, is preceded by a searching discussion which deals with all the main topics of the book ; for example, the dates of the component parts, its doctrine of Free-will, the Messianic Age, the Resurrection, etc., and the importance for the study of the New Testament. The part of it that matters most, chs. 3-14, or more particularly 3-10 (for 11-14 are shown to be of independent origin), were originally written in Hebrew and are assigned to c. A.D. 100. The chief interest in the book for modern readers is the manifest revolt in the author's mind against the narrow and cheerless view, which nevertheless feels obliged to teach, that the vast majority of the human race are going to perdition ; he had a pitiful and tender heart, full of a solicitude for the fate of the Gentiles, which is little less than wonderful considering the contemporary attitude of Rome and the Jews. All this and much more is lucidly and learnedly dealt with by Dr. Oesterley.

## A SPIRITUAL PILGRIMAGE.

*From Faith to Faith* (Putnam's ; 7s. 6d. net) is an autobiography of religious development in which Dr. W. E. Orchard traces the pathway which led to his recent admission, as a 'convert,' into the Roman Church. The autobiography proper, which occupies about two-thirds of the work, is of absorbing interest. In it Dr. Orchard records the story of his evangelical conversion, the stern intellectual discipline by which he fitted himself for the work of the ministry, the religious and mental development he underwent during his two pastorates at Enfield and The King's Weigh House, and the extremely difficult and painful experiences through which he passed in connexion with his final submission to Rome. Few readers, it is to be hoped, will be able to read unmoved of his growing perception of the importance of an adequate doctrinal basis for Evangelicalism, his devotion to the idea of Universal Peace, and his sustained and fearless endeavour to promote understanding and ultimate corporate union between the sundered communions of Christ's Church. It was during the later years at The King's Weigh House that the problem of reunion became especially acute, and Dr. Orchard

lls us that he was increasingly realizing that the abandoning of the claims of Rome, 'even if conceivable, would deprive all Christendom of stability, as us the one concrete example of unity, and leave without any guarantee that eventually the very foundations of Christianity might not be surrendered.'

The terms of submission presented the real difficulty, and especially the phrase in the formula reception by which the convert is required to declare that he abjures and detests all heresies, schisms, and sects opposed to the Catholic Church. However, by the aid of a dictionary, obviously somewhat hurriedly consulted, and by the aid of the Latin tongue, Dr. Orchard was able to surmount the obstacles, and so to renounce the Churches which, successively, he had been the pride and ornament. The last three chapters are propagandist. There is much acute reasoning in these chapters, and not a little penetrating criticism, but the author never really discusses his vital assumption that the Roman Church actually is the One Church, founded and commissioned by our Lord. How easily the difficulties are evaded is shown by the almost naïve statement: 'If we would be man we must be rational; if rational ethical; if ethical evangelical; if evangelical catholic; if catholic Roman; that is the logic of progress, freedom, light.' Surely, it is only those who want to be convinced who can swallow the baseless assumption we have italicized! But we must not judge in bitter words concerning one whom we shall always honour for his piety and evangelical convictions. None the less, the wonder remains whether one who has changed his spiritual house often will find in Rome his permanent home, or prison.

#### CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

*What It Means to be a Christian* (Faber & Faber; net), by the Right Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester, originated in a large address to the clergy and churchwardens of the Diocese of Gloucester. Accordingly, it looks, and seeks very successfully, to combine theological and philosophical theory with simplicity, clearness, and reality, and thus to be appreciated and understood by clergy and laity alike.

The exposition of Christianity here presented is divided into three parts, the Christian faith, the Christian life, and the Christian Church. Under the first part are treated successively the doctrines

of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Trinity. The fourth chapter deals with the Christian morality, while the fifth and sixth chapters deal with the doctrines of the Church and the Sacraments. There is a concluding chapter on the Hope of Immortality. It will be seen that the volume covers the ground of Christian Doctrine, and that it concentrates upon the fundamental doctrines.

There is nothing very new or striking in the treatment, but it has the merit of being carried out in view of recent discussions. And where the exposition touches upon controversial matters, as in the doctrine of the Sacraments, Dr. Headlam is very frank in the declaration of his standpoint. Speaking generally, his standpoint is that of a modern conservatism, with the avoidance of extreme positions. Consequently, his book may be regarded as typical of the Anglican approach to Christian Doctrine. But it will also be found profitable and informative by readers of all communions.

#### CHRISTIAN UNITY IN PRACTICE AND PROPHECY.

A very important, interesting and exhaustive treatise on *Christian Unity in Practice and Prophecy*, in these days ever more increasingly pressing itself upon the conscience of all Christians, has been published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. (14s. net). The author is Mr. Charles S. Macfarland. He has shown a deep and highly praiseworthy determination to place at the disposal of all his readers as complete a statement as is possible, especially in the six appendices, of all recent deliverances of Councils at Stockholm, Lausanne, Jerusalem, and Lambeth. The writer lays stress on the value of such Conferences, as representative men of all the Churches come together, and find in prayer and hymn their one essential unity. The Church has but one gospel, and that has been more splendidly voiced in the 'Te Deum' than in any creed, and more realized in devotion, in a common fellowship, than in any form of church service. The essential unity of the gospel has its own constraining and unifying influence. In the ages the dogmatisms of men and the decisions of Councils, giving authoritative place to creeds, which at best were but approximations to the understanding of the Faith, and the laying of emphasis on Order, which is ever a secondary matter, has tended to divide the Church, and lead to those separations, the continuations of which to-day the deliverance of Lambeth declares is a call to penitence. The unity

of the Church, our author abundantly proves, can be found only in a 'real and true loyalty to Christ,' and never in any confessional Statement. We agree that while differences of credal statement may at first have been necessary, they have all to give way in their separateness, as a fuller view of the truth as a whole is being reached. What is ever important is the deeper truth lying beneath and beyond all temporary expression, which by its own essential dynamic urges the human spirit on to better expression, for life is ever more than form. If the formula 'Faith and Order' is used harm may result. If the Faith is made supreme it will in course secure its own order and expression. The author shows how Rome has made Christian unity almost impossible as it limits the Voice of God to one Order, and to one fold. Rome has thus ignored the working of the Holy Spirit, and the truth of the one flock with many folds.

---

#### ARCHÆOLOGICAL LIGHT ON THE EARLY CHRISTIANIZING OF SCOTLAND.

Not many students of the growth of Christianity in Scotland have paid any attention to what archæology has to disclose. It has remained for Dr. G. A. Frank Knight, who is universally known for his archæological scholarship (as evidenced by his 'Nile and Jordan' and other productions on the Near East), to deal with this interesting aspect of the matter. He has given us a veritable mine of early Scottish religious history in his latest work, *Archæological Light on the Early Christianizing of Scotland* (James Clarke; 2 vols. 24s. net). The book, as the author admits, is revolutionary. The current belief is that Scotland was a pagan country until St. Ninian built his first church at Candida Casa towards the close of the fourth century, and that after this missionary's death the light died down until the land was again evangelized by St. Columba in the sixth century. Dr. Knight combats this mistaken idea. He produces abundant evidence to show, not only that Christianity had been introduced into Scotland long before St. Ninian arrived on the scene, but that numerous evangelists—more than eighty—educated at Candida Casa and elsewhere continued to labour throughout the land, and had built scores of churches before Columba landed on Iona. The author's facts are based on reliable archæological proofs (gathered from the ruins of churches, monuments, carved stones, wells, etc., in every part of the land), fortified by authoritative references to over fifteen hundred volumes which

he has consulted. One valuable characteristic indeed, of his work lies in the innumerable notes (wisely placed at the end of each chapter) containing the references, together with much additional information.

Beginning with the early ages and the religion and morals of the ancient Celts, Dr. Knight deals with the coming of the Romans and the arrival of Christianity, and thereafter describes the romantic career of some four hundred Celtic missionaries, some of whose names have been entirely forgotten, and ends with the period of the Culdees, the triumph of Christianity over Norse paganism, and the passing of the Celtic Church. He has succeeded in producing two volumes of extraordinary interest, which will remain a valuable reservoir of the archæological, political, and religious life of Scotland from prehistoric times to the reign of Queen Margaret. The work is one that looks at the development of the Scottish Church and State from a fresh angle—the archæological one, and should thus be in the hands of every student of Scottish history, whether minister, antiquarian, or others interested. It is clearly written, chronologically accurate (so far as knowledge goes), and bears evidence of brilliant scholarship on every page.

---

SIR JAMES JEANS.

In *The New Background of Science* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net), Sir James Jeans, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., gives us a fresh and important study of those problems concerning space, time, and the constitution of matter which physicists like himself, Sir Arthur Eddington, and others have done so much to bring before the public mind in recent times. Many readers who have been charmed by the writer's fascinating pictures of the universe around us will find the present work less picturesque and somewhat more difficult. Particularly when he comes to deal with matter and radiation he expresses himself in mathematical symbols which will be Greek to the majority. His progress throughout might be likened to an aeroplane sailing brilliantly overhead, but disappearing from time to time in a cloud. Mathematicians who attempt popular exposition might do well to consider that, if the average reader has gained such knowledge as he possesses of the Newtonian physics without, perhaps, ever having mastered the theorem of Pythagoras, it is not likely that he will ever be made to comprehend the mysterious fact that  $pq - qp$  is equal to an imaginary fraction.

Planck's constant. Sir James Jeans deals at considerable length with that most elusive subject, isenberg's Principle of Indeterminacy, and discusses the views of Einstein and Planck. The following sentences may briefly indicate some of the conclusions. 'It is through the wave picture of matter that we must approach reality, and the abandonment of a space-time representation of matter would seem to be the first step on the journey.' 'The classical theory represented matter as situated wholly in time and space, and at the same time governed by a strict determinism. The newer theories, which alone agree completely with observation, show that we can retain either a space-time representation of the older pictures of Nature or the strict determinism, but never both.' 'So far as science now draws any picture at all of matter, it is one which seems in every way queer to mind. . . . Yet the essence of the present situation in physics is not that something mental has come into the new picture of Nature, so much as that nothing non-mental has survived from the old picture.'

So much has been written recently on Wesley and Wesleyanism that there would hardly seem to be room for anything fresh. Here, however, is a book which claims with reason to fill 'a gap in Methodist literature.' The title is *John Wesley in the Eighteenth Century*, by Mr. Maldwyn Edwards, M.A. (Allen and Unwin; 6s. net), and it is devoted to 'a study of his social and political influences.' The writer has made an exhaustive search through contemporary newspapers and pamphlets bearing on his subject, and from these he throws much light on Wesley's political views and his influence on the great public questions of his day, such as the American War of Independence, the French Revolution, the Abolition of Slavery, and various humanitarian reforms. The whole makes a contribution of real value to Wesleyan literature.

It will be remembered that Dr. Gossip of Glasgow gave a very full account of Professor Maurice Goguel's *La Vie de Jésus* in the October number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The French edition was published by Payot, in Paris. We are now delighted to welcome a translation, the publishers of which are Messrs. George Allen & Unwin, London, the price 25s. net. The translation has been made by Miss Olive Wyon. Dr. Goguel has promised to follow up *The Life of Jesus* with a

second volume dealing with the Apostolic Church. We shall look for this with interest.

*The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net), edited by Mr. H. K. Luce, M.A., is the latest addition to the 'Cambridge Greek Testament' series. The editor, who is a schoolmaster, had the Sixth Form boy in view when writing the Introduction and Notes. The Introduction is short, and points out that Gospel criticism has followed the three main lines of textual criticism, source criticism, and form criticism. It also contains an up-to-date account of the study of the authorship, date, and sources of the Third Gospel. The editor's theological standpoint is liberal. The Notes are simple, clear, and well arranged. The Greek text is also clearly printed and arranged, and the whole volume is a worthy addition to a notably useful series.

*The Advancing Company*, by Miss Phyllis L. Garlick (Church Missionary Society; 1s. net), is 'the C.M.S. story for the year 1932,' and it is as full of interest and fascination as any of its predecessors. It deals with the work of the Society under four heads, Africa, the Near East, India, and the Far East. The narrative is rounded off by an introductory chapter on the Fact of Advance, and a concluding chapter on the Cost of Advance. The gist of the story is that fields are whitening to the harvest, and that native churches are advancing in numbers and capacity in spite of the most adverse circumstances, but that the work is crippled by failing resources at the home base.

The Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., has published volume vi. in his series of 'Modern Handbooks on Religion' under the title *Jesus: A New Outline and Estimate* (Heffer; 6s. net). The stamp of the book is modernist, but the author makes an able and courageous attempt, not only to depict the Historical Jesus, but also to discuss His relation to Deity along lines suggested by the theory of emergent evolution. The treatment of the Atonement is much less successful, and hardly amounts to much more than the idea that the death of Jesus symbolizes and expresses God's offering of Himself 'for the purpose of convincing mankind as to His own nature and character.' Besides these topics, the book includes fresh discussions of such themes as the Finality of Christianity, St. Paul, the Church, and the Future of Religion. Dr. Bouquet is by no means certain that the more complicated and ancient forms of Church organization (whether for

worship or administration) are the best, and is convinced that 'unless we have little short of a new Reformation or a kind of religious revolution, it is hardly rash to predict that in many localities churchgoing will have almost ceased in twenty years' time.' This is, indeed, a thoughtful and challenging volume.

*A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England* (Longmans ; 3s. 6d. net) appears to be a re-issue of the third edition (1911) of a work by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, M.A., which was first published in 1908. One of its aims is to clear away a few of the misconceptions that prevail about the Evangelicals ; and perhaps it is fitting that in this centenary year, when much is being written about the Oxford Movement, attention should be directed to the history of a great party in the Church of England which owes its existence to an Oxford Movement of more than two centuries ago.

*The Life of John Colet*, by Sir J. A. R. Marriott (Methuen ; 6s. net), is a charming book. Colet is little known by 'the public.' Erasmus, his friend, everybody knows. Sir Thomas More many know. But Colet is an unfamiliar name. The reason is perhaps that his influence (which has been both wide and deep) on thought and religion was exercised without any blowing of trumpets or party cries, and perhaps because he was not an extreme man in any sense. At any rate Sir John Marriott has done his part in revealing Colet to the world, and no one will read this book with anything but the greatest pleasure.

In *The Macdonald Presentation Volume* (Milford ; 34s. net) we have an excellent tribute to Professor Duncan Black Macdonald, the celebrated Arabic and Islamic scholar at Hartford Theological Seminary, Connecticut. The volume consists of thirty articles by former students, presented to him on his seventieth birthday. Many of these students have risen to high positions as professors in other parts of the world, and their articles show a thorough mastery of the language, literature, theology, philosophy, and history of the Semitic race in general and of Islam in particular. Those on 'Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan Influences on Arabia,' 'The Problem of Semitic Alphabet Origins,' 'Remarks on the Study and Teaching of Arabic,' and such like, form a valuable reservoir of Semitic knowledge, and make an excellent background for Old Testament study. Some of the articles, such as 'Philonism in the Fourth Gospel,' and 'The

Portrait of Jesus in the Sayings Source,' are of interest to New Testament students also. Professor Macdonald is well known for his various publications, and especially his contributions to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and the *Encyclopædia of Islam*. We commend the volume to Biblical students, and especially to those interested in Semitic and Islamic literature, as a valuable addition to their library.

Mr. Humphrey Milford has published at the price of 1s. the *Visitation Charge of the Bishop of Oxford at the Diocesan Visitation, 1931*. After discussing the practice of the Reservation of the Sacrament, the Bishop of Oxford goes on to consider (i) the fact of schism, (ii) the method of God's revelation, (iii) the gospel-message and the Church, (iv) the application of his positions to present problems. The whole is conceived in the interests of Church unity.

Two books of interest to teachers of the Bible need little more than mention to commend them. One is *More about the Junior Department*, by Miss Ethel Archibald Johnston, who has already written admirably on other themes (National Sunday School Union ; 1s. 6d. net). There are chapters on the junior scholar himself, on his worship, his lesson, and his life. A useful list of books is added. The other book is *The Teaching Church at Work* dealing with methods in adult religious education (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. net). Each chapter is by a different hand, and the subjects dealt with are group discussion, tutorial corporate study circles and preaching. The book is meant as a guide to the further study and religious training of people of all sorts who need and wish to make advance in religious knowledge.

Background books are of very great value in religious education. The more the teacher knows of the *milieu* the better he will teach. We have many books of this nature, like 'The Local Colour of the Bible,' by Budden and Hastings. A fresh contribution to this type of help is *The World of Jesus*, by Mr. Henry Kendall Booth (Scribner's 8s. 6d. net). It is a good book, including everything on which a teacher would like information—the environment of Jesus, physical, intellectual, social, and religious. It is also a beautifully printed and bound book. Our only criticism is that on many subjects the information given is meagre. We could have spared the large print in order to get more detail. But what we have is excellent.

nd there is a list of books for further study, not  
y any means exhaustive but perhaps sufficient.

*The Book of the Master of the Hidden Places*  
Search Publishing Co.; 12s. 6d. net) contains  
The House of the Hidden Places' and 'The Book  
of the Master,' by Mr. W. Marsham Adams, formerly  
Fellow of New College, Oxford. It is now nearly  
forty years since the late Mr. Marsham Adams  
first propounded his theory as to the intimate  
correspondence that exists between the Egyptian  
so-called 'Book of the Dead' and the passage-  
chambers of the Great Pyramid. That theory found  
expression in the two works above-named, written  
in 1895 and 1898 respectively, and these have now  
been amalgamated by Mr. E. J. Langford Garstin,  
the editor of the work before us, into one consecutive  
whole, redundancy being avoided, and in  
cases of overlapping the more striking version  
being selected. He has also given in an Appendix  
a selection of texts from the Ritual corroborative  
of the parallelism indicated by Mr. Marsham  
Adams. It is claimed that these two works are  
the most remarkable that have been produced  
during the last half-century by any Egypto-  
logist; and that, while some of Mr. Marsham  
Adams' theories may not find acceptance in certain  
quarters, he has established a definite relationship  
between the 'Book of the Master' and the pyramid  
of Khufu, the 'House of the Hidden Places.' We  
commend this interesting volume, which contains  
many photographs and drawings, to the attention  
of our readers.

Those who appreciated 'St. Paul's Life of Christ,' by Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith, will be glad to read his new book, *The Testament of Glory*, and other Johannine Studies (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). There are three 'studies' in the book, one on the Gospel with the title of the book as its heading, one on 'St. John himself,' and a third on the lesser Epistles of St. John. There is a great deal of quiet pondering behind these chapters. The reader is conducted through the meditations by a guide with spiritual insight, and finds everywhere something suggestive and revealing. Mr. Griffith really makes the Gospel live for us. It is a big thing to say, but he does make it in some ways a new thing, vivid, real, impressive, and full of light. Those who love the Fourth Gospel will love this book.

The author of *Human Welfare: The Social and Educational Essentials*, Mr. Michael Kaye, M.A., Ph.D. (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), has a preface entitled 'My Convictions.' He tells us he is inclined to be a Liberal but objects to Free Trade (and also Protection); he believes in world-controlled production and distribution but rejects Communism; he welcomes the reinforcement of religion, but thinks Christianity useless and wants to see an altruism independent of religion. Somehow or other an altruistic state is to arise from amiable parents and loving teachers. The two parts of this book are on 'Society' and 'Education,' and both make a plea for a somewhat utopian ideal that seems to have no visible foundation.

## The Message of the Epistles. The Letter to the Galatians.

By H. G. WOOD, M.A., WOODBROOKE, BIRMINGHAM.

WE sometimes put to ourselves the fortunately  
speculative question, 'If we were asked to sur-  
render one of the Gospels, which should we select  
as sacrifice?' If a similar question were raised  
concerning the corpus of the writings of Paul, we  
should certainly not be prepared to let the choice  
fall on Galatians. If we were to be permitted  
to retain only one of the Apostle's letters, it might  
very well be Galatians that would be honoured as  
the one with which we could least afford to dispense.

Few letters are more important for our under-  
standing of the essential Paul, of the man and of his  
faith.

As a historical document, the letter presents  
many difficulties. When was it written? We  
may well hesitate between a date immediately  
before the Council at Jerusalem described in Ac 15,  
or a later date during Paul's stay at Corinth. To  
whom was it written? The South Galatian theory  
commands the majority of suffrages to-day, but

those who are most confident that the letter is addressed to the Churches in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, would admit that the alternative supposition is at least arguable. How is the letter to be harmonized with the data concerning Paul which are recorded in Acts? Or, rather, how are the said data to be harmonized with the auto-biographical details given in the letter? The testimony of Paul himself is clearly of more weight than the evidence of Acts, and if correction be needed, we must correct Luke by Paul rather than *vice versa*.

Here are difficult issues enough, which might be more readily solved if we could trust the rather conjectural source-criticism of Acts which is at present in vogue. If the visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem recorded in Ac 11 and Ac 15 are really one and the same visit described in two different sources, a great many possibilities of harmonizing apparently conflicting data emerge. A judicious survey of these possibilities will be found in Dr. Kirssopp Lake's note on the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem in vol. v. of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. But if the letter is subsequent to the Council described in Ac 15, it would seem as if the author of Acts has attributed to the Council a decree which is probably of a still later date. That Luke telescoped accounts of two distinct Councils, and so mistakenly antedated 'the four-fold regulations for Gentile Christians in the regions which looked up to Jerusalem as the Mother Church,' is a suggestion adopted by Dr. W. F. Howard, in the 'Study Bible' volume on *Acts* (p. 145 f.), and there is much to be said for it. The same view is enforced by D. Hans Lietzmann in his essay on 'The Apostolic Decree,' in *Amicitiae Corolla*.

Certain peculiarities of the letter add to the difficulties of locating and dating it. The letter-writing forms which have been made familiar to us from the papyri, and which Paul usually follows, are here abandoned. He does not begin with a thanksgiving, as is his wont, and he does not end with a series of personal greetings. Nor does he associate any one with himself in his opening salutation. He writes in his own name, and not as senior partner with Sosthenes, or Silvanus or Timothy. If another name had appeared along with his own, or if he had added personal greetings from one to another at the close, we might have been able definitely to assign the letter to the second or third missionary journey, and we might even have been able to answer finally the question, Who were the Galatians? But the very characteristic of the letter which limits it on this side

shows how intensely the writer was affected by the occasion which compelled him to write, and how closely he was grappling with the real issues.

The fact that he writes in his own name and mentions none of his companions, may be due to the necessity of asserting his authority. Part of the vivid interest of Galatians, like that of 2 Corinthians lies in the element of self-defence. The first two chapters are the sketch of an *apologia pro vita sua* which might have been the most remarkable religious autobiography on record. Like another *apologia* which is being widely re-read this year, Paul's defence was drawn from him by an attack which he resented. 'What does Mr. Newman really mean?' asked Newman's critics. 'What does Paul really stand?' asked Christians with Judaizing tendencies who belittled the work and authority of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Paul they asserted, was a trimmer. He suited his gospel to the weaknesses of his hearers. Among Gentiles, he deprecated or ignored circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic Law: among Jews, he advocated and preached it. He tried to be all things to all men. He must know how important and valuable the Law is, but to please men he keeps silence about it. Another more sinister reason for Paul's silence may have been suggested. He likes to keep his converts to himself, he does not want them to be made much of and appreciated by other people (see 4<sup>17, 18</sup>). He is jealous of other teachers who bring a fuller message, a richer gospel. And in any case, Paul's authority as a teacher and minister of the gospel is, so to speak, second-hand. He is not one of the original disciples of Jesus. He has not known the Lord. All that he knows about the Christ he has received at second-hand from Peter and James and those who were disciples before him. His very commission as a preacher has been passed on to him by other men. To some such attack as this, Paul is responding, and the very vigour of his reply betrays the intensity of his resentment. He calls down a curse on any one who preaches a gospel other than his own (1<sup>9</sup>), and he gives expression to the bitter ironical desire that those who believe in circumcision would be thorough and have themselves emasculated! (5<sup>12</sup>). But it would be wrong to stress the personal side of the controversy. Paul defends himself because defence of himself is a necessary part of the defence of his cause.

The somewhat obscure but moving passage in ch. 4<sup>12-20</sup> seems intended in part as a disclaimer of anything in the nature of personal pique. 'You

d me no wrong.' It is not the feeling that his converts have been disloyal to him personally that prompts the vigour of his remonstrance. And he does not really object to other teachers laying court to them or bestowing attention on them. 'It is good to be the object of an honourable attention at all times, and not merely when I am present with you (and can keep an eye on your courtiers !)' (4<sup>18</sup>). He is perplexed and would hardly vary his tone of voice so as best to reach their state of mind. But while he is not concerned about his purely personal honour, he cannot let his authority as an apostle be lightly challenged. And so he gives us a revealing sketch of his life, to show his independence of the original apostles, and at the same time to assert their agreement with or approval of his work and outlook.

He begins by claiming that he holds his commission as an apostle immediately from Christ and not from God. His authority was not of human origin, nor was it derived from God through any human agency. He is not dependent on Peter. Perhaps, as Lake suggests, he disclaims such dependence on Ananias as is implied in the story of his conversion in Ac 9. In all essentials, the gospel came to Paul through revelation from Christ. Looking back, he could see that his experience had been under guidance when he had least suspected it. How apt we are to assume that our lives are not being shaped or guided unless we are aware of it! But at least when the moment of revelation comes, we can see the real meaning of the past, and Paul knew that, like Jeremiah, God had chosen him from his birth for a special call and a glorious task. If his independence is to be manifest, he must recall his contacts with Peter and James. Only two visits to Jerusalem fall to be considered. It was not until he had got hold of the gospel for himself and had begun to preach it, probably in Arabia as well as in Damascus, that Paul went up to visit Peter. This happened three years after his conversion, and whatever he learnt from Peter, it would add nothing essential to the convictions and the call which came to him on the road to Damascus. Many years later he visited Jerusalem again, in obedience to Christ's revelation, not under orders from older apostles, but he did seek and secure their approval for his missionary labours. Evidently some circumstances connected with this visit were a source of embarrassment to Paul. The grammar goes to pieces in vv. 4-6 of ch. 2, and some emotional tension seems to be the source of confusion. Was Titus circumcised? Does

Paul admit this but deny that this happened under compulsion? Did Titus by an injudicious voluntary acceptance of the rite of circumcision place Paul in an almost indefensible position? Had Paul and Titus together made a concession which they afterwards regretted and tried to minimize? We cannot tell, but the reference to Titus is certainly confused and embarrassed. The facts about Titus were clearly well known and not easily explained. But there was no doubt as to the upshot of Paul's conference with the 'pillar' apostles. If Titus was circumcised, never for one moment was Paul asked to regard his case as a precedent. No obligations arising out of the Mosaic Law were to be imposed on Gentile converts. A much clearer demonstration of Paul's independence and authority was offered by a subsequent incident at Antioch, when Peter vacillated on the question of social intercourse between Jewish and Gentile converts, and Paul rebuked him to his face. The substance of this rebuke introduces the vital issue which the letter is to discuss.

The immediate question in dispute between Peter and Paul may well have seemed a trifle to the former. To the latter it was a matter of life and death. When Peter first came to Antioch, in the spirit of Christian fellowship he joined Gentile Christians at their meals. When certain came from James, Peter realized that this association with Gentiles prejudiced his position in relation to Jews, and he had been entrusted with the mission to the circumcised. He thereupon withdrew from sharing meals with Gentile Christians, and he did not see why his fellowship with them might not be adequately expressed in other ways. Paul will have none of this. A fellowship which does not enable men to sit down to a meal at the same table together, is no fellowship. The fellowship must be maintained, and if Peter suppresses his Christian impulse and declines Gentile Christian invitations to dinner, then the Gentiles must turn Jew in order to preserve the unity of the Christian community. That is what Peter's action amounts to. He is forcing the Gentiles to become Jews, and that is preposterous. The simple conditions for the association of Jewish and Gentile converts, embodied in the decree of Ac 15<sup>29</sup>, had clearly not been devised or accepted.

Was Paul right in his rebuke of Peter? Surely, he did see farther than his colleague. A Church that accepts caste and the food-taboos connected with caste, or that acquiesces in class-distinctions, is clearly not Christian, and will languish in futility.

The issue is still a live one on the mission field and at home. A very interesting experiment made by a High Churchman to foster table-fellowship in a home church is described in A. F. Webbing's autobiography, *Something Beyond*. We are still far from realizing Paul's ideal of church-fellowship.

The problem confronting Paul in Galatia was not, however, the terms on which Jewish and Gentile Christians might share a common social life, but the wider issue, does observance of the Jewish Law add anything to Christianity? To be a follower of Jesus Christ, must one also be a disciple of Moses? If one accepts the obligation to observe the Law of Moses, does one thereby become a better, more mature Christian?

The Churches in Galatia seem eagerly and hastily to have embraced the suggestion that Christian converts should be circumcised and become practising Jews. Who put pressure on them to follow this course? Did certain come from James, preaching this second form of the gospel? Did Jewish Christians from Jerusalem as their headquarters conduct a mission throughout Paul's churches? Or is it possible that converts from among the God-fearing Gentiles associated with synagogues in towns like Derbe and Lystra still felt the attraction of Judaism? Or was there a handful of Jewish Christian converts in each church who hoped to disarm the hostility of their fellow-nationals by showing that they, the Christian Jews, could make good Jews out of Gentiles? The reference to the desire to escape persecution for the Cross of Christ in ch. 6<sup>12</sup> seems to justify the last suggestion. If the Roman authorities were already distinguishing Christianity from Judaism, the attraction of circumcision might be due to the hope of securing thereby the protection of Judaism as a *religio licita*. But whether the pressure came from Judaising travelling evangelists, or from the local synagogues, or from the Jewish Christian element in each church, the movement to embrace Judaism had been rapid and enthusiastic.

Paul, in the light of his own experience, had no doubt that this was retrogression, not progress. The gospel, not the Law, is the means of salvation. Faith in Christ can accomplish moral and spiritual transformations, which formal obedience to Law can never compass. The gospel supersedes the Law, and the Law can add nothing to the gospel.

Paul opposes Law and gospel so sharply that he must clearly be classed as a dialectic theologian. His thought is dialectic enough to satisfy Karl Barth or Karl Marx. No dignity is given to the Law when it is described as 'our slave attendant.'

'Paul, we may note, never thinks of the Law as giving rudimentary education until higher education can be provided: nor does he regard it as a foreshadowing of Christianity (the idea of which Hebrews is full).' So Dr. A. W. F. Blunt comments, and rightly. The Law is an interlude, and its function is negative. It brings no real communion with God, for it is given through the agency of angels—a circumstance on which the Jews prided themselves, but which proves the Law's inferiority to the gospel. Abraham was God's friend before the Law was given, and the promise was made to Abraham before the yoke of the Law was accepted. So the Law is an afterthought in the working out of the Divine purposes. It is no positive aid to righteousness; it only deepens sin. This may seem a one-sided estimate of the Law, and no doubt it is one-sided; but it reflects Paul's own experience, and also embodies his realization of the meaning of the Cross. He had apparently experienced the suggestive power of negative commands—a position which he works out in Romans, and which has been recognized as true in modern pedagogy and psychotherapy. But beyond that, fidelity to law, a legal religion, was responsible for the rejection of Jesus. Christ died a death pronounced accursed by the Law. But God has vindicated Jesus by raising Him from the dead. The curse of the Law is invalid. The claim of the Law as the instrument of righteousness is shattered. Since this is so, the barrier between Jew and Gentile is down, and salvation is offered to the Gentile, apart from the Law. The same lesson may be read in Peter's conduct. His impulse as a Christian—the prompting of the spirit of Christ in him—is to join in fellowship with the Gentile converts. Then he remembers the Law, and in deference to the Law he puts up the old barrier between Jew and Gentile. What has happened, then? Has Christ proved to be the minister or occasion of sin? God forbid! Peter's original Christ-given impulse was right enough. He has made himself a sinner, by going back to the Law. If he had realized the full implications of his faith in the Son of God, he would never have been so foolish.

The arguments by which Paul seeks to establish his fundamental position are not very convincing to us. His verbal niceties and strained allegories may have been more effective *argumenta ad homines* in his own time. He had to prove his case from the Old Testament, and the methods of interpretation were accepted as valid by his contemporaries. Fortunately, as Dr. Blunt observes, 'Paul's—and other people's—arguments are often less convincing

an their conclusions,' and his conclusions are so portant that we may be thankful that his friends accepted his conclusions, whether because or in spite of his arguments.

It is hardly too much to say that the whole future

Christianity in Europe depended on Paul's usual to let the gospel be tangled up with the old world. As a variant of Judaism, Christianity would never have permeated and dominated the Western world. Dr. Claud Montefiore has said that Jesus took the treasures of Israel and made them available to mankind. This is a tremendous truth, but it took nothing less than the death of Jesus to break the shell of Judaism, and release its inner treasures. Paul saw this. A crucified Christ has discredited Judaism as a system, and set the Gentiles free from any obligation to accept the Law. Christ died to secure this freedom for us and to build up a new society across the differences of Jew and Greek, slave and freeman, male and female. The new society thus entered on its career without being in bondage to the past, and if it developed a legalism of its own, at least its canons and standards were own reaffirmations of Old Testament and Stoic ethics, and not a blind adherence to Jewish traditions.

But the early Church did not rise to the level of Paul's insight, and so Galatians has continued to be revolutionary ferment, particularly active whenever Christianity has crystallized afresh into a legal religion. Luther's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is a classic record of its awakening power.

Perhaps we are never more than half convinced that the attractive power of Christ, the deep sense of obligation to Christ who has died for us, is the power of God unto salvation, and not rules and regulations. It is amazing, this confidence of Paul that comparatively undisciplined Gentiles will become clean-living, will instinctively do the right thing, and live in the right spirit, if only they love and adore the Lord Jesus. Yet we do know what old Dr. Chalmers meant when he spoke of the expulsive power of a great affection. Formal codes of conduct, rules and regulations, may have their place, even their necessary place, and their function may not be as purely negative as Paul seems to have supposed. Yet they do not go to the root of the matter. They give you, Paul might have said, a tamed and disciplined animal, but not really a new creature. William Penn said of George Fox that 'he was civil beyond all forms of breeding.' Fox was country-born-and-bred. He knew little of the rules of polite society. Yet his loyalty to Christ made him so respect his fellows that men felt in him the essential gentleman even if outward polish might be lacking. On the other hand, a courtier with a full knowledge of etiquette and perfect manners, may smile and smile and be a villain still. The true change of heart can never be effected by regulating conduct from without. God's gentlemen are those who, like Paul, can say, 'the life which I now live, I live by faith, by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me.'

## Grace and Order.

BY PRINCIPAL A. E. GARVIE, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

If we may assume that the Kingdom of God on the lips of Jesus, and Grace in the Apostolic writings both mean God's *sovereign saving activity*, His love and action, and if that activity within the believers by the operation of God as Holy Spirit, we can approach the subject of Order with a guiding conception which should lead us towards fuller understanding. It is entirely consistent with the Christian conception of God that the Spirit's operation in the believer should result in Church, Ministry, and Sacraments; and an extreme Pro-

testantism which in its opposition to Catholicism regards these as human institutions and not Divine appointments seems to me to err seriously. This contention may be briefly justified.

(1) Biology would describe man as a gregarious animal, philosophy interprets him as social personality. Human personality is realized only in society. Men have many common needs, interests, activities, and these constitute them a community. (a) Religion in its earliest phases is not individual, but communal (tribal or national); and even when

individualism in religion appears, the social bond is not severed, for the individual realizes his relations to God in his relations to his fellow-men. One of the falsest things ever spoken about religion on either its human or its Divine side is that it is 'the flight of the alone to the Alone.' The historical founders of new religions called individuals into a society. (b) The very nature of Christianity as the universal Divine Fatherhood, the common human brotherhood in Christ, love to God and equal love to self and neighbour as the supreme law demands more than any other religion community; and does not merely command, for, as Augustine's two sayings, *Jube quod vis* and *Da quod jubes*, suggest, God in the Spirit as the common possession of believers gives; in that common possession they are necessarily made a community, one body of Christ, one temple for God, because one habitation of the Spirit. As God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is one, so the Church is in its essential nature a unity; its external divisions are deplorable, tragic, historical accidents, using the word in the scholastic sense; they do not belong to its essence. I am entirely in agreement with those who regard these divisions as unhappy, and unity as what is to be made man's endeavour because it is God's purpose. Nor am I content that this unity should be *invisible*; to call it *spiritual* is to regard Spirit as it is never regarded in the New Testament as power which fails to manifest itself. As the love of God found its manifestation in the grace of Christ, in the Incarnation the Word became flesh, God seen and known by men as man, so this unity of the Church seeks and should find manifestation in a common ministry and common sacraments; and so long as our divisions forbid and hinder that, the Church as unity remains invisible.

(2) While we must affirm that all believers have the Spirit of adoption, so that all can say, 'Abba, Father,' that all as God's children have freedom of access unto God in Christ, that He alone is the High-priest of our confession, and He has redeemed men to become a Kingdom of priests unto God, yet that does not exclude a ministerial priesthood as well as prophethood in the Church. I have never been able to understand how those who are prepared to accept the prophethood are so opposed to priesthood. There was false prophecy as well as corrupt priesthood in Israel; and men may abuse their office in representing God to men as well as in representing men to God. The theologian who claims to be an infallible oracle is just as great a danger as the celebrant who claims to be an exclusive channel of mediation between God and man.

*Abuse does not remove use.* In leading men in their worship to God as in making known the gospel there may be, and must be in the Church as a body differentiation of organs, functions, gifts. If God by His Spirit call a man to the ministry, and endows him with the proper gifts for the efficient discharge of his vocation, he may be regarded valued, and used as a gift of God's grace. That there should be a ministry ordained as representative of the community to discharge its corporate functions of preaching the gospel, administering the sacraments and exercising the cure of souls or pastoral oversight is no contradiction of the priesthood of all believers or their common possession of the Holy Spirit. Rigidity and exclusiveness are forbidden by the consideration, that 'the Spirit breatheth where it listeth' (Jn 3<sup>1</sup> & Vm); and by the evidence of that truth in the history of the Church when the *latent prophethood* or priesthood of the Christian people became *patent* to meet an urgent need. To this consideration we must return; meanwhile it may be conceded that liberty with order can best be realized in the Church when in its corporate functions it has representative organs to whom God has given the *charism*.

(3) As a Protestant, and as I understand the New Testament, the primary and most important if we can make any distinctions here, function of the ministry is the preaching of the gospel, to which as the Protestant Confessions maintain the administration of the Sacraments must be subordinated. As at Lausanne there was agreement on the message of the Church to the world—the gospel—the plan of the preaching in the Church is not a subject which divides. But a few words must be directed against the tendency among some Christians to deprecate preaching in comparison with the sacraments. It is true that man is body as well as soul, that there is access to the mind through all the senses, that the object seen may in some persons make more impression than the language heard, that, as the new psychology insists, the subconscious has a potent influence on experience and character no less than the conscious; but all these considerations do not justify a challenge of the truth that it is the consciousness which most for mental health direct and control the subconscious phenomena of mind, and that articulate speech is the most effective channel for the conveyance of instruction and influence from mind to mind. The sacramentalist who calls the new psychology to his aid needs to be reminded that this psycho-analysis has much more to do with mental disease than mental health, and that to be

subject or victim of unknown and unwilling complexes is not a condition to be much desired. To repeat a figurative statement I once used before, Christ is much more likely to be found amid His disciples in the lighted upper room of conscious reason, conscience, spirit, than in the dark, and, many psycho-analysts represent it, foul, cellar the sub- or un-conscious. A religion which attaches importance to truth will not prefer other approaches to the mind of man to the hearing ear id understanding heart.

(4) This aberration, as I must regard it, set aside, we may admit the value of sacraments, the outward symbols of the inward grace. In using the word symbol I am not depreciating the effectiveness of the sacraments; for a symbol is real only in that it conveys what it signifies. The water in baptism, and the bread and the wine in the Lord's upper are symbols only in so far as they convey cleansing and nourishment to the soul by the Spirit. But we must surely add that while the gift of God there, it is received and can only be received by spirit; spirit with Spirit must meet. Just as in the preaching of the gospel grace is offered, so in the sacraments; but can we say that it is given until it is received? Recognizing the dangers of superstition, the following considerations may be offered in urging that the depreciation of sacraments is less than the depreciation of preaching is to be explored.

(a) If it be the case, as I believe it is, that Christ appointed the two sacraments as the symbols of initiation into and continuance in His community, then loving obedience to His loving command may anticipate love's reward. We are not under law, but under grace; but, if we love Him, we shall gladly keep all His commandments.

(b) As God conveys His beauty and truth and goodness in the order of Nature, through material objects, and physical processes, as God was manifest to men as man in the flesh, as in His teaching the incarnate Word embodied truth in a tale, taught the Heavenly Father's goodness in His care for the flowers of the field and the birds of the air, instead of defining God's love, He told the story of the lost sheep and the lost coin, so visible objects and processes may as fitly serve as the expression of truth and the channel of grace even as audible words. That there is in this world-wide sense a sacramental principle must be conceded; only it seems to me too universal to justify the exclusive use which is often made of it.

(c) We must fully recognize the necessity for symbolism in religion. God is not the altogether

inscrutable, the altogether ineffable, as mystics have often maintained; but that we cannot fathom the depths, or scale the heights, of the Divine reality in our thought or speech we must gratefully and not regretfully confess. For a God whom we could measure by our ideas or our words would not be great enough for our need. Jesus, who knew and made God known as no other has done, did not give a definition of God. He gave a symbol. 'Our Father which is in heaven.' That conveys more to the developing Christian experience than any definition could express. A symbol may be acted as well as spoken; and thus the sacraments may convey more than words could express.

(d) A minor consideration which, however, deserves to be mentioned, is that in the sacraments the celebrant, if he is careful to use only the language consecrated for such use, and to adhere to the acts so consecrated, is less distractingly present than is the preacher; his personal peculiarities do not intervene, and the blessed memories and the sacred associations that through the centuries have been transmitted from the Lord Himself may and do, to the sensitive imagination, make Him alone present with no human barrier between.

II. I hope in the preceding paragraphs to have shown how far a convinced and consistent Protestant can go to meet what claims to be the Catholic position. Regretfully and reluctantly I turn to indicate more briefly where differences emerge. It is the rigid exclusiveness of the Catholic contention which offends both my reason and my conscience.

(1) I cannot find in the New Testament any warrant for the assumption that Jesus concerned Himself at all about questions of order. He gathered His disciples around Him, and when His bodily presence was withdrawn He left them to the Spirit's guidance. Nor can I find that the Apostles, in organizing the Church, laid down laws of permanent and universal validity. Organization was necessary; but what organization there was was not uniform, because adapted to varying local circumstances or associations. The Apostles held a unique position because of their personal relation to Christ as His disciples and witnesses of His resurrection. It was endowment by the Spirit which qualified for any function as organ of the one body. With the highest possible respect for the late Bishop Gore, I cannot regard his procedure in beginning with the second century and going back from it to the New Testament as legitimate. I must take my stand with such Anglican scholars as Hatch, Hort, Lightfoot, and Streeter. Such a structure as the Catholic position would in my

profound demands a foundation in the New Testament so plain and sure that there would be no room for differences among scholars. The Protestant position, as I hold it, is not in the same way affected by this uncertainty, as it does not put forward any such rigid, exclusive claim for its Order.

For me the question cannot be settled by any appeal to the Apostolic Age. The ratio between absolute eternal and relative temporal values, the divinity eternal and the humanity accidental, God as Father but and Holy Spirit in an absolute eternal value. Grace as God's favour, action, quality from God imparted to men is an absolute eternal value, manifested and communicated in time. Even Church, Ministry, and Sacraments are so closely related, as I have tried to show, to that Grace, the operation of the Spirit, in such a way that we can regard them as temporal values inseparable for us from the Eternal. But I cannot, although I have tried to discover an organic vital relation between the organization of the Church which emerged in the second century and these absolute eternal values which it served to preserve and protect under the local and temporal conditions. That organization was so very largely determined by those conditions, the empire by Greek philosophy, the polity by Roman Imperial administration, that I cannot regard it as belonging to the absolute eternal value of any separate or universal. I am not of those who would derive all these developments as merely a secularization of the Church; their relative historical value I freely admit, but history means change, progress dependent on adaptation of the permanent to the changing, and this principle I cannot exclude from the Christian Church in what has been called its ecclesiastical aspect as a human institution in time. The history of the Christian Church is also its judgment. The unity of the Church has led, at one period in the Catholic position, to an enforced uniformity, revolt against which has resulted in division. The hierarchy has become too often a hindrance and not a help to pure and sincere religion. Belief in sacraments has led to superstition. It cannot be claimed that this

organization has proved itself so effective an organ of the spirit that it and its action can be accepted as legitimate. Judged by no human standard put forward a claim to be the only proper expression of the purpose of God. Surely the world has changed since the early centuries in the Roman Empire that what was necessary, appropriate and effective then and there cannot claim acceptance in all continents and by all centuries. God fulfills Himself in many ways; what has emerged under historical conditions may deserve to be submerged when these conditions change. The Epistle to the Hebrews should teach us not to confuse eternal substance and temporal shadow.

(3) My conception of God, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Preserver and the Ruler of mankind through all the generations, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Father of all men in Him, makes it quite impossible for me to think of God as confining one order as the exclusive or even regular channel of His abounding grace and grace. I believe that the Catholic position, or any dogmatic exclusive Protestantism rest on a yet imperfectly transformed conception of God, and such a transformation, emancipation from the letter of Scripture, adaptation to the thought and life of a progressive race, and above all the revelation of the Father by the Son and the continuing enlargement of the Spirit demand of us, and make possible to us. I can not think of God as the *sacramenta doctrinaria* master, who will be sure to them only by this or that prescribed channel. It is only in a purified and elevated conception of God, common to all Christians, that we can hope to find the reconciliation of the Catholic and the Protestant position. Protestantism at least than Catholicism has much to unlearn and forget, much to learn and remember before that reconciling truth can be reached. The final emancipating word can come not from anyone apart from the living, from seen and same untempered, unshaken by the traditions and customs of the past, and inspired by the vision of the Church that is to be, in which Christ shall make for Himself a body finer and wiser than any which has hitherto been His.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### The Day that I do Make.

BY THE REVEREND A. J. MATTHEWS, SUNDERLAND.

'The day that I do make.'—Mal 3<sup>17</sup> (R.V.).

GOD is going to make a day ! God makes all the days. The days of rain, and the days of sunshine ; holidays and work-days ; birthdays and death-days—God makes them all. But this day that the prophet speaks of is a special day. A great day, a golden day, a perfect day. It has not come yet, but it will come, because God has promised that He will make it. I believe He is making it now. Days take a long time to make. Have you ever tried to make a day ?

Some of you are skilful in making things, and the things we make are more to us than the things we buy. Like the little boy who was proud of the boat he had made. 'Somebody helped you,' said the other boy. 'No, indeed not,' blurted out the little boat-builder ; 'I made it out of my own head,' and then he added, 'and I have plenty of wood to make another.' Of course he did not mean that his head was wood, though his words seemed to carry that idea.

Have you ever tried to make a day ? Do you think you could make one ? I am sure you could. There was a little boy named Tony, and he had a birthday. Most boys and girls have birthdays, haven't they ? although 'Topsy' in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* said she hadn't one. She 'just grewed,' but most boys and girls have birthdays that are thought about, and prepared for, and celebrated in all sorts of pleasant ways.

Tony thought about his birthday for a long time beforehand, and talked about it too, because, you see, he expected to have a great many presents, and he believed the day was going to be the happiest day he had ever known. Sure enough, when the day came, he received a lot of presents. He was up early in the morning, because he expected the postman would have something for him, and he was not disappointed, and he danced with glee. You see he was only seven.

Among the presents was an engine that one could wind up, and it would go round and round the rack that was prepared for it. Tony was delighted with this, and thought it the best present of them all.

Now Tony had an elder brother named Harry.

Harry was ten years old, and on the morning of Tony's birthday, he came downstairs late. Tony was waiting for him, and shouted, 'Come and see all my lovely presents !' 'Come and look at my beautiful engine !' 'I don't want to look at your presents,' growled Harry. 'Oh, do come,' said Tony, and he dragged Harry into the room where the presents were. 'Just look at my lovely engine. Isn't it a beauty ?' 'It's a silly, stupid, ugly old engine,' said Harry. 'I hate birthdays, and all your presents are horrid.' He swung his arm across the table, and over went the engine and, falling on the floor, off came two of the wheels. 'Oh ! oh ! oh !' cried Tony as he burst into tears, 'you have broken my precious, my lovely, my darling engine.' And he sobbed as though his heart would break. So Tony's day was spoiled, made unhappy, miserable. Who made his day so wretched ? Harry, of course. If he had come down and said in a jolly way, 'Many happy returns of the day, Tony ; let me look at your presents ; what a fine engine ; let me wind it up and see it go,' what a different day he would have made for Tony. You can make a day happy or unhappy, bright or sorrowful. I believe God wants us to help Him to make His day. I believe it will come quicker if we help Him. How can we help Him ? By trying to make each day a happy day for those about us. Then others will see what a jolly thing it is to make happy days, and will try to make them too, and then when everybody is trying to make happy days, God's great, golden, splendid day will come, and the whole world will be filled with its glory.

#### Watched !

BY THE REVEREND LAWRENCE J. STAGG, B.A.,  
HIGHER BROUGHTON.

'I am with you alway.'—Mt 28<sup>20</sup>.

Here is a story told about our Prime Minister.

Mr. Macdonald has been on a visit to Rome recently to talk with Signor Mussolini about important international questions. The Italian Government picked out some plain clothes' detectives, whose one duty was to guard the Prime Minister while he was the guest of the Italian Government. Wherever Mr. Macdonald went one of these detectives had to go ; of course, none of them made himself a nuisance—just followed along behind and kept a watchful eye on Mr. Macdonald

—and on other people as well ! One of the disadvantages of being famous is that one has to be looked after very carefully, for it is strange that there is nearly always some one ready to hurt a man as famous as the Prime Minister of England.

One morning Mr. Macdonald went for a stroll to see Rome ; he walked on for a while, and then discovered he did not know where he was—he was lost in Rome ! Not a very terrible thing, because he only had to ask some one to direct him to the British Embassy, where he was staying. But he thought the quickest way to get back was to go by taxi, the driver would know the way ; so he hailed one, and was soon at the Embassy. When he reached there he put his hand in his pocket for the fare, but the driver said, ' No fare, thank you, sir.' ' No fare,' said Mr. Macdonald, ' what do you mean ? Do you carry folk about for nothing ? ' ' I am a police officer,' said the driver, and Mr. Macdonald understood. The officer had seen the Prime Minister leave the Embassy ; he had started up his engine and followed him, threading his way in and out of the traffic, but never losing sight of the Prime Minister. When the Prime Minister was lost he was so close up that Mr. Macdonald could not help engaging him.

Have you ever been lost ? Perhaps not ! But do you remember when you went out to do an errand for mother and you had to go a bit farther away from home than you had been before, and as you went mother said, ' You are sure you know the way ? you will not get lost ? ' And you replied very independently—and a little indignantly too—' No, of course I shall not get lost.' You did not know how anxious she was all the while you were away, especially as you were a bit longer than you need have been ; you stopped for a gossip here and joined in a game for a few minutes there, and mother was looking for you at the door when you came round the corner of your street. But now you have grown up, and you do not need any one to watch you or be on the lookout for you ; you are old enough to take care of yourself.

Yet we are all being watched—every one of us here. We ought to be very, very thankful that God is always watching and following us, that we can always turn to Him and ask Him to show us the way when we are in difficulty, or afraid we are going to get lost. For you will find as you go on growing up that there are so many things to see, so many things to do, so many people ready to give you advice—each one saying something different—that you will need One who knows the right and best way to go, the right and proper thing to do.

God has given us Mothers and Fathers that we can ask them for help and guidance. Some one has said, ' God could not be everywhere, so he made Mothers.' I think he ought to have added ' Fathers' too ! And we can always ask them for guidance ; they will be glad to tell us the right way. I am sure God speaks through our parents to guide us in the journey of life, lest we should be lost. He speaks through our teachers and preachers also.

Then there is that little voice inside that we call the voice of conscience. You have heard it telling you to do this or not to do that, and when you have disobeyed you have become very unhappy and made other people unhappy too. But when you have obeyed you have felt happy and been able to make others happy too. God was guiding you in that voice to save you from becoming lost.

He has given us Jesus to show us the way to go through life, and following Him we shall not get lost. He is alive in the world to-day, and we can talk to Him as we pray, and He will always be there to guide us. Most wonderful of all, if we do get lost, if we do wrong and feel we are getting into strange places that are horrid and make us unhappy, Jesus has been following us, He never allows us to get out of His sight. He came to seek and to save that which was lost. When we say we want to go back to the right way and do the right thing, He is always ready to lead us, He never grumbles, He talks to us so kindly that we wonder why ever we went astray and got lost.

‘ I am with you alway ’—and that means You.

### The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Chivalry of Jesus.

‘ He that findeth his life shall lose it : and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.’—Mt 10<sup>39</sup>.

In this brief sentence, Christ sets in strong antithesis that love of life which issues in the most tragic form of loss, and that fine carelessness and consequences which has for its recompense an eternal gain. He seeks to correct the common estimate of what life consists in. ‘ The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.’

‘ Old Daniel Quorm comes to mind. “ I do often see it, friends ! ” said Dan’l, “ I’ve watched it for years. Here’s a young fellow doin’ good in the Sunday school and other ways, promising to be a useful man when we old folks are gone home. Bu-

mebody sends down word that he can make half a crown a week more wages in London. That's enough. No prayer about it; no askin' the Lord what He do see. No thinkin' about the Lord's work. 'I must get on,' he says, and he says it soous as if it was one o' the ten commandments—it 'tisn't, friends, 'tisn't, 'though you do hear it often!' <sup>1</sup>

For the man who possesses both capacity and character, and who, having selected his path, sticks to his plan of life undeviatingly, the chances of success seem to me to-day very great. But wisdom means more than attention to the gospel of getting on. Life will at the end seem a poor affair if the fruits of its exertions are to be no more than material acquisitions. From the cradle to the grave it is a course of development, and the development of quality as much as quantity ought to continue to the last. For it is in the quality of the whole, wedged in all its proportions and in the outlook on the Eternal which has been gained, that the test of the highest success lies, the success that is greatest when the very greatness of its standards brings in a train a deep sense of humility. That was why Goethe, in a memorable sentence, said, "The fashion of this world passes away, and it is with that is abiding that I would fain concern myself." <sup>2</sup>

Who, to-day, is willing to lay up treasure in heaven? The dust of materialism has obscured the sky-line, and the vision of the City Beautiful has become remote. Some of us have been lamenting that religion has apparently lost its power to draw men's souls to lofty enterprise, and to nerve their arm for strong endeavour. We have looked back wistfully to the days when men hazarded their lives for the sake of the Lord Jesus, and we have wondered why that spirit has become so rare. It is because we have made religion seem too cheap. If we would reawaken the ancient chivalry, we must reassert the ancient challenge. If we would rouse the apostolic spirit, we must reiterate the apostolic call. Religion is not a moral pose—it is a spiritual passion. Discipleship is not merely an assent to certain propositions—it is a great conviction issuing in a glorious crusade. The lost vision of the Cross must be recovered; its primary enthusiasms revitalized, its neglected and forgotten obligations reconstituted and laid afresh upon each individual soul. The vigour of the Church can be renewed, not by lowering the standard, but by lifting the ideal. As a recent writer phrases it: The churches with a future are the churches with

a high threshold; and when the day comes for any general movement towards faith amongst the people, they will be attracted not by appeals which are easy and obvious, but by appeals which are exacting and mysterious. If that arresting passage has any significance at all, it means that we must get back to the original source of our religion, and rekindle the torch of the church's inspiration at the pure flame which glowed in the heart of the Nazarene. We must catch more clearly His accents of authority, and restate in more explicit terms His transcendent claims. Christ never sought to popularize His cause by compromise. He makes the gate of the Kingdom strait, and the way thereto a narrow one; and all who would enter there must struggle. His badge of chivalry is not a coronet, but a cross. His patent of nobility is bestowed, not upon those who lust for dominion, but upon those who are content to take the lowest seat and to become the bond-slave of all. His demands cut clean across the grain of men's most cherished vices, until selfishness, the darling sin, lies severed at the root and slain. In nothing is the kingliness of Jesus more manifest than the way in which He deals with the candidates for His Kingdom. God's warriors may be few, but they absolutely must be fit; and to secure their fitness He submits them to the sternest tests, and sifts the vacant chaff from grain.

Some of the Master's sayings are appalling in their austerity, peremptory in their demand for utter sacrifice. 'No man,' He cries, 'having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.' 'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.' 'If any man will come after me, let him say no to his Self, and let him take up his cross and follow me.' 'He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.'

Is this the way in which to gain a kingdom? Will not such autocracy repel rather than attract the people to His cause? Surely, the Nazarene is ill advised to appear so arbitrary when only a dozen volunteers have gathered to His standard, and one of them is a traitor. It is early in the day to dictate terms. Ought He not to adopt a more conciliatory tone, to ingratiate Himself by pleasant speeches, and thus to win the favour of the crowd? That is the method of the charlatan. Every pretender to a throne, from Absalom to Perkin Warbeck, has endeavoured to pave his way thereto by specious promises.

Had Christ's demands been less exacting, we should have known Him for an impostor and no true heir of universal dominion. The empire of the

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Boreham, *The Luggage of Life*, 205.

<sup>2</sup> Viscount Haldane, *The Conduct of Life*, 27.

world can be won upon no lower terms than these. But is it not a fact that we have sought to cheapen them and to debase the standard which Christ Himself set up? We have eliminated the element of sacrifice, erased the stigmata, suppressed the Cross, and kept a guilty silence as to suffering for His sake and for the gospel's. And we have failed, as we deserved to fail. A religion made easy, men will not have—no, not even as a gift.

It was the heroic age of the Church that witnessed its most rapid growth. Faggot fires and the headsman's axe, which were intended to destroy, succeeded only in establishing more firmly the sway of Jesus Christ. When Nero and Diocletian were ravening like beasts of prey there was no lack of converts. The Church they sought to devastate and to devour was adding to its ranks daily such as were being saved. Danger was their discipline, martyrdom their magnet, and suffering their sacrament. The baptism of pain was the prelude of victory; and through the travail of human souls a new era was born in which the King of the Cross shall yet proceed to His inevitable triumph in the final conquest of the world for God.

To aid that triumph we must recover the heroic note inherent in the call and claim of Christ. We must reproduce in our own hearts the temper which it originally fostered and inspired. The luxurious Church which dwells at ease in Zion is not only impotent against its foes, it is morally incapable of winning the allegiance of its own sons, and disciplining their souls for the battle in which it is their privilege to fight. We must put the trumpet to our lips and sound an alarm in all God's holy mountain. We must set up the ensign and rally the scattered forces. Nothing else will arouse the latent valour of their souls. No base expediency or prudent compromise will win their hearts' devotion. But as they hear the imperial call they will feel the imperious constraint of Christ, and the clans of God will muster, and on the march make this their battle-song :

Strike for the King and live ! His knights have heard  
That God hath told the King a secret word.  
Fall battle-axe, and flash brand ! Let the King reign.

Strike for the King and die ! and if thou diest  
The King is King, and ever wills the highest.  
Clang battle-axe, and clash brand ! Let the King reign.<sup>1</sup>

#### SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Great Irrelevance.

'The dial of Ahaz.'—2 K 20<sup>11</sup>.

King Ahaz was remembered, for a time at least by the people of Judah as the king who erected and bestowed on the nation a gift of striking novelty—no less than a sundial. In fact, that was the monument of Ahaz. Now a sundial was not only a novel gift, it was also a useful gift, if the lines were rightly drawn. Ahaz must be credited with a certain practical intent, as well as with an artistic sense. And if, as seems evident, he went for the idea, perhaps for the actual structure, to Syria or Assyria, then, of course, we must give him credit as a man of catholic taste, whose culture is not to be limited by the bounds of a prejudiced little country like Judah.

What we want to ask is if the gift is worthy as a monument.

Let us look at the story of Ahaz. He came to the throne at a difficult time. Surrounding people were restless and turbulent, and far away beyond the horizon was the sinister power of Assyria, a growing menace to all the weaker nationalities. But trouble sprang up nearer home. Ahaz and his people were startled to hear that Syria and Damascus had formed an alliance against them, with the deliberate purpose of putting an end to the Davidic Dynasty and of establishing in Jerusalem a king of their own choosing. The confederate nation moved rapidly and made a notable capture, the seaport of Elath. An assault on Jerusalem failed, and with the strongest fortress in Palestine in his hands the position of Ahaz could not be considered desperate; but he and his people were seized with unreasonable panic, and appealed to Assyria for help. An embassy was dispatched with a huge tribute, which is called a 'present,' the treasures of the palace and temple were rifled, and the Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser, must have been gratified to learn that the King of Judah regarded himself as his 'servant and son.' Of course, the great king felt in with the scheme. The armies of Assyria were soon in motion. Damascus was taken; Gilead and Galilee also came under the yoke, and their inhabitants were led captive. Ahaz travelled to Damascus and offered his personal homage to Tiglath-pileser. However other people took this, there was one man in Jerusalem whose cheeks burned with shame. Isaiah, the prophet, had vehemently protested against this alliance with Assyria, and when he saw Ahaz passing out of the gates on his embassy he must have felt that the depth of humiliation had

<sup>1</sup> R. M. Gautrey, *The Chivalry of Jesus*, 7.

reached. But Ahaz does not seem to have troubled much. He returned to Jerusalem, head full of artistic curiosities he had seen on his journey. You find him presently erecting a new altar in the temple on a pattern brought from Damascus. On the roof of the temple he builds stairs designed for the worship of the Host of Heaven—an ornate idolatry which his catholic taste had encountered in his travels. And, finally, he built the sundial by which he was long remembered.

Are we so certain now that this monument is worthy? The monument cannot be worthy unless the man is worthy. Here is no mark of personal distinction. It is a symbol of national disgrace. A monument, it seems, after all, means nothing. It can be only a symbol at the best. What matters the foundation on which it is built—the life that beneath. A nameless tombstone may be monument enough for one whose life has been kind and courageous and true; his name is safely enough inscribed on the heart of God. But all the sundials in the world will not serve to redeem the history of the base and the cowardly, betrayers of nations, of honourable men.

Some may think this a ruthless way of dealing with a king who is evidently a man of artistic taste. Is there no place in religion, in life, for the artistic temperament? Surely. The world and religion are endlessly debtors to every living soul that takes some spark of genius from the hard realities of life, or catches some gleam of truth or beauty in the valleys of human struggle and defeat. But artistic temperament must not claim freedom from the ordinary requirements of human honour and sincerity, and if it does claim such freedom, it must be flatly denied to it. The fact is that we did not trouble about a monument if we make clear that as foundation we have the three things which Ahaz lacked.

(1) *A real concern for our own people and nation in age.* Ahaz was not really a human at all, in the sense of having in him the genial blood of charity, the hot blood of patriotism. To abase himself before his people without an effort at resistance, this was worse than a humiliation; it was a treachery. And no character of any consistency can be built up on the ordinary loyalties of life, a genuine concern for national well-being and the general progress of mankind. It is easy to isolate ourselves; easy to cut ourselves off from responsibilities; easy, when emergencies arise, to make ill-advised and disastrous compromises; but we shall have to pay for all that, and others will have to

pay for it, when the folly of selfishness begins to appear, when the aloofness which we once practised becomes our torture and our punishment, and when there fall dark and irretrievable about us the shameful consequences of betrayal. There is no worthy character nor any enduring monument without the sense of social responsibility.

(2) We must also build on *personal honour* as well as on a keen social responsibility. Ahaz was seemingly indifferent to his personal honour, or insensible of it. Yet there was not one moment in all his transactions with Assyria, since the time of panic began until he erected his fatuous sundial, in which personal honour was not involved. Our personal honour is involved in the life of every day, every hour of every day. Our honour is being compromised not only by the unmanly deed, the sneer, the slander, the cowardice, the meanness, the treachery, which stand out dark and fateful to the general view; it is affected by our course of action, by the general line of life we have elected to follow. If Ahaz says, 'Assyria let it be,' then every moment of his career will besmirch his personal honour. For Assyria means surrender of nationality and the death of freedom. So if you say, even tacitly, 'Let money be my chief concern,' or 'Let me have the best time I can,' or 'Let me just accept a policy of drift in a difficult world,' then your honour is involved. Out of such straits it is hard to see how your personal honour can emerge with such credit as merits a monument.

(3) And this, further, we miss in Ahaz, apart from which every monument rests on sand: *loyalty to the best he knows.* He has fallen from the highest that he knows. He has betrayed the nation, he has betrayed himself; and he ends by betraying his God. Think of it; a king of the House of David who is contemporary in Jerusalem with Isaiah, one of the great spiritual forces of history, comes back from Syria with plans for a new altar on which sacrifices may be offered to the heavenly bodies.

To find a child of Abraham, in line of all the glorious traditions of Jehovah's power and grace, reverting to this because he has seen something of it in Syria—this is as if a Christian stopped 'working at' the Christian religion and began to worship Mahatmas. It is the mark of a silly, unbalanced, and unethical mind. It also marks a mind without humour. But for any type of mind to stop short of reverencing the highest it knows is so fatal that character, strong, generous, and great, is quite impossible on such a basis.

So the sundial of Ahaz is an irony, a satire, a pitiful irrelevance, the sundial of a man who could

not read the time of day, who could not discern the signs of his age. Why will men play with fate? Why will men be so afflicted with shortsightedness—the myopia of which the writer of 2 Peter speaks? He tells us why; because they lack faith, knowledge, virtue, patience, temperance, brotherly kindness, and charity. Why do men act so foolishly? At the root it is because their nature has never really come in contact with a greater, never been caught into the eddy of a great cause or been smitten by the fiery gleam of a great ideal. And we have but one name for that Ideal and that Cause. It is a name that stands for honour, because it stands for absolute reality and absolute purity. It stands for humanity, because it is the essence of compassion and love. More than that. No other name to us stands so truly for God, as the Name which is above every name, Jesus Christ our Lord. On this foundation, if any man build, his work will abide. His memorial is secure.<sup>1</sup>

#### SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Merciful.

'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.'—Mt 5<sup>7</sup>.

The commendation of the merciful comes next after that of those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. This is not without meaning. The heart that is set on righteousness is prone to be intolerant of moral weaklings and hard on those whose standard is not so high. When that happens to us we have merely escaped one peril to fall into a deeper. The world values a kind heart more than a scrupulous conscience, and, in its rough judgment, the world is right. How terribly devastating that which seems the way of right can become when it loses the spirit of love we can see in the Inquisition, when the very body of Christ was crucified afresh in an effort to keep it pure. Jesus bids us remember that the way of right is the way of love, and the only right way of love, in such a weak and sinning world as this, is the way of mercy.

What He means by mercy here is often understood in a narrow sense. It is often restricted to mere humanitarianism and pity. The work of mercy is limited to kindness to those who are broken and beaten in the battle of life. It is Red Cross work, so to speak. No doubt this comes within the scope of Christ's great word. Every hospital is a home of mercy. It is worth while to remind ourselves that it is the spirit of Christ which has kindled the compassion whereby these things

<sup>1</sup> A. Connell, *The Endless Quest*, 113.

are done. Mercy, in this sense, was barely known among the ancients; and where it was known was regarded as a kind of extra goodness—not, we see it now, the very least that goodness will do. If we have risen so far above the jungle as to care for the weak and the suffering instead of carrying them out into the forest to die, it is Christ who has led the way and made pity for the feeble a common place of goodness. And only through the power which Christ sustains can this be effectively done. As Mr. Stephen Graham says, 'Philanthropic societies, parliaments, reform movements, and the like, are doomed to failure, unless they are served by men and women with Christ-faces.'

This kind of blessedness needs no description to those who have stretched out strong hands of pity to their fellows. No one can help to heal another's trouble without finding some wound in his own heart dry up. That is indeed the only real way of healing for ourselves—to pass out of self-absorption and self-pity on the tide of a great compassion. This does not always follow that, because you care for the weak and suffering, others will care for you. It did not happen so with Christ. There are times when it almost seems as if the very people we try to help dislike us for it. 'I do not understand why that man should hate me,' said a cynic once. 'I never did him any good.' This virtue, like others, must be its own reward. But if our hearts are turned from ourselves we do have our reward for a well of sweetness is opened up in our own hearts and often in the world around us, when our own dry spirits are refreshed and comforted.

The song is to the singer, and comes back most to him;

The gift is to the giver, and comes back most to him;

The love is to the lover, and comes back most to him;

It cannot fail.

But this use of mercy is a narrowing of the word. Christ meant by mercy a far wider thing. He was thinking of our attitude to the morally, as well as the physically, unfit. The word outlines our whole policy to those who have gone wrong. There are many classes of wrong-doers. There are those whose sin is very largely private and limited in consequence to the wrong-doer himself, though 'man liveth to himself.' There are those, again, who have done some ill to ourselves; and some like our criminals, both individuals and nations, whose sin has done damage to society, and brought evil on the community in which God has set us up.

together. How are we to treat these people ? It is a very practical question. It is this relation of the wrong-doer which Christ has mostly in mind in this beatitude.

What does mercy in this sense mean ? It means, one thing, the kindly judgment, not of the sinful but of the man himself by whom it has been done. How sweeping we are in our condemnations ! And they are often apt to be artificial. The things we condemn in others are not always the things which Christ would condemn. What the world seems to need more than anything is a healthy hatred of wrong. But notice : Christ is not speaking of the sin ; He is speaking of the sinner. Christ's interest is always in the man. Now is he to be cured ? It is with this in mind that He calls for the merciful judgment. And is it not right ? How can we judge till we know the facts ? And how can we know the full facts till we know the man himself—know what hidden fires of passion burn in his blood kindled long ago by others' sin, what lurid temptations have tracked him down, how far the community has contributed to his fall ? Aye, and what struggles he made before the ship went down at last.

But mercy means more than a kindly judgment of the wrong-doer. It means the effort to restore him to righteousness. That is always what Christ is interested in. How to get the sinner back—back to his place in our friendship, back to his place in society, back to his place in the love of God. Mercy's campaign of restoration operates in various directions. There are those who may have injured ourselves. Mercy there means the attitude of forgiveness. It is perfectly true that forgiveness is not complete till there is repentance, which just means that there is no complete restoration till the prodigal comes home a son. As a matter of fact, we can have no fellowship with a man whose spirit is not in harmony with ours. But do not let us forget that the thing that wrought in the Prodigal's heart was the father's forgiving love. Had the father taken up a stand-offish position and locked the door, there would have been little hope of the prodigal's repentance. His sense of sin would never have broken out in prayers and tears ; it would have stiffened into a stubborn defiance. Blessed are the merciful, for it is they, and not the ruthless judges, who awaken the prayer for mercy.

This has its application also to society's treatment of the criminal. Nothing needs more overhauling than our thought about crime and punishment. Our outlook on this matter is largely based

on retribution and fear, not on mercy. It is partly based on giving a man what it seems to us he deserves, not that which will make him a better man, and partly on the need to protect society from being robbed or hurt, by making the would-be criminal afraid. That is very roughly our theory of punishment, and, with all its appearance of being watertight, it is as full of holes as a sieve. So far as putting an end to crime is concerned our system is three-parts a failure ; for a large number of the crimes of the country are committed by the same people who need an army of officials to watch them, both when they are in prison and when they are out of it ; while statistics prove that crime is decreased according to the humanity of our dealings with the criminal. But the difference between us and Jesus is that, while we are studying how to keep our goods, His question is how the thief is to be kept from stealing them, not by locks and bars, but by being turned into an honest man. 'I was in prison and ye visited me.' That shows how His mind was running. That is His thought of the true goal of mercy.

But what about justice ? we ask. What of the consequences which follow sin, and *must* follow sin ? No one can ever escape the consequences of sin, whether society deals with them or not, for the worst consequences of sin are in the soul of the sinner. As for what we call our justice, where would we stand if our rough-and-ready methods of punishment were to be applied with the standards of Jesus ?

Mercy has its application to nations as well, and we are coming to see it. Here it means the effort to restore international fellowship. That was the real point of Christ's word about loving our enemies. His purpose was, not only that we should not become like them, infected by their spirit of enmity, but that they should be turned into friends. It is fellowship, not mere security, which must be our aim in international life ; and indeed only in the way of fellowship can real security be obtained, as we are beginning to see.

And now we are in a position to understand what Christ means by the last clause of His beatitude—'for they shall obtain mercy.' His meaning becomes clear when we see forgiveness as restoration to His fellowship. How can we be restored to His fellowship except as we have His Spirit and are ready, at least, to live in the Divine order, which is the order of love ? It is not that God refuses to forgive the unmerciful spirit. It is a matter of literal fact that He *cannot*. For the man who has not the spirit of love has not really returned to the

Father's house. We have not found our place in the great family of God till we are cherishing the Father's spirit.<sup>1</sup>

#### EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### The Science of Prayer.

'Ask, and it shall be given you ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'—Mt 7.

If there is any truth in religion at all, the spiritual world is not only real, but *the* real world. 'The things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are unseen are eternal.' It is difficult to believe this. And 'worldliness'—that hard-worked and much-abused and variously defined word—is simply not believing it. Worldliness is not enjoying this world, but regarding this world as an end in itself. Worldliness is saying to the soul, 'Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, eat, drink, and be merry.' That is what it says : but what it means is, 'to-morrow we die.' That is the essence of worldliness. Eating, drinking, and being merry are not wrong. That is where so many definitions of worldliness miss the mark. It is in trying to feed the soul with these things : to make these things an end in themselves. It is like putting water in a petrol tank or feeding an engine with wholemeal bread.

Here, in the text, are the laws of Prayer—part of the science of the spiritual world. 'Ask, and it shall be given you ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.' They are not only to be accepted, but to be studied. Not only to be received, but to be put to the test. Let us, by the help of the Holy Spirit, attempt to get a little below the surface of these laws of the spirit.

Turgenev, the Russian writer, once said that 'all prayer is, in effect, an effort to prove that two and two don't make four.' A man who believed that, of course, wouldn't pray. The idea that prayer is a means of altering the will of God is childish. On the contrary, prayer is one of the chief means of getting the will of God done. 'Prayer is the boat-hook that brings not the land to the boat, but the boat to the land.' There is no means of proving what prayer will do except by praying.

The first thing to see is that these three brief phrases are not mere repetitions—redundancies. Ask, seek, knock, don't mean the same thing in slightly varying language. They mean different things. They are like the Courts of the Temple : the Outer Court, the Inner Court, and the Holy of Holies. They stand for the doctrine of progressive-

ness in prayer—a point that few people grasp. As you enter by different doors—ask, seek, knock—so you get different results. Here is not merely the injunction to pray, thrice repeated : but something of the science of prayer.

'Seek' is more than 'ask,' and 'knock' beyond them both. But it begins with the simple, and goes on to the deepest.

It begins with the injunction to ask :

Prayer is the simplest form of speech  
That infant lips can try.

It is that : but it is only that to begin with. You want to test prayer begin by asking. And you will get anything you ask for ? Certainly not. Christ never placed the treasures and the power of the Unseen at the behest of the immature and irresponsible. You don't give your children everything they ask for : why should God ?

There is nothing about which there is more confusion in the average mind than 'unanswered prayers.' 'I have prayed and I have not received ; therefore, prayer is an illusion.' What have you not received ? 'The thing I asked for.' But looking at it in that light, are you not setting your will against God's ? What does Christ say ? 'Ask, and it shall be given you.' What the words mean literally is, 'Ask, and there shall be given you.' Christ does not, He could not, promise all the resources of the Unseen to the spiritually immature. If we put it to ourselves, are there not many things we have asked for that afterwards we know would not have been the right thing ?

Even in this earliest stage of initiation Christ under pledge to vindicate prayer to us : to prove the reality of the spiritual in virtue of our sincere approach to it. Ask, and there shall be repaid. Are we doubtful about prayer ? Does it seem that prayer has failed ? Is it not because even the elements of this mighty power of the spiritual world are unknown to us ? So many sincere and baffled souls have failed to find, because they do not know what they are looking for. They do not know what the promise really is ; or perhaps they are expecting the splendid richness of the scientist's achievement when they are only on the very threshold of knowledge. We do not treat the spiritual with ordinary common sense. We ignore its laws as we should never dream of ignoring the laws of a physical science.

The first condition is not to know, or contrive, or analyse, or agonize, but to ask. Asking is the cause : and the corresponding effect in the spiritual world is 'there shall be given.' But many a man

<sup>1</sup> J. Reid, *The Key to the Kingdom*, 127.

fails to see the answer to prayer because, distressed or rendered indifferent by not finding the thing sought, he fails to see the thing given. Remember, the secret of prayer is not to be asking for this or that—the secret of prayer is to be asking *God*. Let us make our requests in our own way, and look for God's answer in His way.

No man—however limited, however hesitant, however doubtful—ever asks without receiving, in terms of spiritual reality. Remember—the spiritual is a comparatively unknown land to many, and it is necessary to get acclimatized, so to speak, to learn our way about. When Christ once opened a blind man's eyes, at first he could hardly see anything at all—‘men as trees walking’—and only a little by little ‘all things clearly.’ We have never thought of spiritual things in terms of such everyday experience. But that is because we have forgotten, or never realized, that there are laws in the spiritual world as real and as binding as the laws of light and sound. We know very little of them. But we know something. And the first is, ‘Ask: and there shall be given.’ ‘I sought the Lord in my distress, and He answered me—with strength in my soul.’ ‘Father, if thou be willing, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done.’ ‘And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.’

Commissioner Catherine Booth, in her newly published biography of her father, Bramwell Booth, quotes the following from one of his letters :

‘Prayer has made me conscious of the new life unexpectedly emerging within the life I am living. It is in such moments as though I come to a rift in the great wall of circumstance and look out upon a free and boundless sea. . . . But there stand out in my life now various occasions when, in praying for help for myself or for the souls of men, there has been this same deep consciousness of something new added to me, some awakening of a new spiritual faculty, or, shall I say, a new spiritual sense, with which to realize the Divine. I have had many remarkable answers to prayer in the way of material gifts and signs and leadings. Those, however, appear quite small in retrospect, so far as their permanent value is concerned, compared with these inward uprisings of my spirit—which have often had little or nothing to do with requests for any particular thing—to meet, I humbly believe, to know and to meet the Spirit of God.’

And so from ‘Ask, and there shall be given,’ we move on to ‘seek, and ye shall find.’ Seeking means persistence, and persistence means progress. There is nothing here of the idea that there is something

more spiritual or prevailing in saying twenty ‘Our Fathers’ instead of one. Rather is it a matter of our own preparation than of God's readiness. ‘I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.’ The asker is often the man who is content just to touch the fringes of the spiritual world now and again, a sort of spiritual mendicant. He asks and ‘there is given unto him.’ He comes to the door in his need and passes on. But the seeker is the man who comes inside to dwell there. He has come to see not only that the spiritual is real, but *the* real. The first man discovers that there is something there. The other has begun to discover that everything is there: that that which is unseen is eternal. And what happens to him? He finds. To the first man the spiritual is something of which he receives occasional grace and evidence: to the second man, the man who from asking has become a seeker, his relation to the spiritual world is that not merely of one who receives, but of one who takes for himself.

When a child first goes to school learning generally is irksome. Such knowledge is more or less thrust upon him. He learns as little as he conveniently can: but later, if he is a seeker, he takes the secrets of knowledge for himself. He takes rather than is taught. He begins to explore for himself. In the first case, it is given to him: in this case, he finds.

Asking is more or less an instinct—an instinct of weakness, need, helplessness: seeking is a pursuit—the sense of growing power: the region in which a man begins to discover in the spiritual world a permanent place of his own. He finds. We may not always find what we are looking for, though we often will. But this deeper aspect of prayer is like the philosopher's stone. It was never found, but the search led to the discovery of many other valuable things. Though we cannot explain the working of spiritual laws, we can see their operation.

The last stage is, ‘Knock, and it shall be opened.’ The principle of this is in what has gone before. We have got to be very sure before we come to this. There are specialists in spiritual things just as there are specialists in medicine or chemistry. Not only is persistence here, but confident and experimental persistence: the personal certainty that the thing we have laid hold of is mighty beyond imagination. Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and ye shall see. The door swings back and you enter in. John had entered in: Paul had entered in. ‘For me to live is Christ’—not will be—is.’ For most of us the door does not open very far on this side. We ask, and there is given to us. We seek, and we find. Sometimes some other great soul opens the door

and lets some of the glory through for us. But for most of us the door is yet fully to open.

But if we have asked and received: if we have sought and found, at least the final opening of the door that hangs between the temporal and the eternal will hold nothing but joyful expectancy for us.<sup>1</sup>

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Serpent and the Dove.

'Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.'—Mt 10<sup>16</sup>.

Our Lord was not stating a paradox when He asked His disciples to be wise as serpents and harmless as doves. For one thing He demanded it from them as a necessity for their work. As witnesses for the Gospel of Love they would naturally be simple and guileless in heart. That was the sort of life and character they were called upon to show forth to the world. But as reformers to overturn the world, to invade the strongholds, they would have to meet the world's wisdom with wisdom as great. They were face to face with terrible odds. The words were meant for a warning in the situation in which the Apostles were about to be placed, to beware of men, the hatred and malice and prejudice of men. But, like most of Christ's words, they have an application beyond the particular occasion. Here we have, not only a rule for the disciples' guidance in their first missionary enterprise, but also the practical ideal for character.

The difficulty which the disciples had in reconciling these opposites in their missionary enterprise corresponds to the difficulty we all have in some form or other. Business men have their practical problem in these days of reconciling integrity with keen competition. We have all to arrange unflinching honesty with necessary self-interest. Even in religious work the same problem must be solved of combining prudence with absolute truthfulness. Something of the wisdom of the serpent is needed to insinuate the truth, to gain men to guilelessness by holy guile. In the culture of individual character the same problem in some shape or other emerges for us all—how to be simple in heart and pure in aim, and at the same time display the wary caution needed to walk unfalteringly and live truly; how to be generous to others and yet to be wise even in our generosity so as not to do evil instead of good; how to keep ourselves unspotted from the world and yet to use the world as not abusing it;

how to be prudent without being cunning, to be wise without being selfish, to be good without being foolish, to be simple without being weak.

We have seen the two factors, necessary even for practical life, and we can see at once how lop-sidedness of character arises from the want of either of the factors.

(1) One sort of lop-sidedness is the common one to be all prudence and sagacity without simplicity of mind and purity of heart. Men of the world too often let the serpent in them swallow up the dove. They may have great success, as the world counts success, for they have no qualms of conscience. They are not hampered by the problem of reconciling simplicity with prudence. They escape the problem by omitting one of the factors. In the affairs of life, in politics and commerce and every branch of activity, these men often have what seems like complete success. They are turned out of the rough-and-ready refining pot of public opinion as pure gold, and the time is not yet when they are seen to be base metal at heart—but the time shall be. Such a man would smile at the notion that a man can be too clever, can have too much of the serpent's wisdom. He would smile at the notion that he has anything to learn from the simplicity of the simple man whom he despises, from the harmlessness of the dove or the weakness of a little child. He cannot see how the foolishness of God can be wiser than men. From of old has the world seen the quick feet of schemers stumble into the pit they have digged. Mere cleverness is a fatal gift; mere ambition brings its own nemesis. The serpent's head is crushed by the heel of a child. The omission which was at first an aid to success becomes a fatal loss, leaving a barren life, a bankrupt character, an impoverished soul. That is not success which does not enrich the soul and add strength to the spiritual nature. And we need to remember that there is nothing spiritual in itself about the wisdom of the serpent.

(2) But our Lord did not expect His disciples to make that mistake. He did not look upon them as wolves to learn from the sheep and as serpents to learn from the dove. But the opposite. His object was to warn them against the other mistake, the other form of lop-sidedness; that is, to neglect the prudence necessary both for character and for work. The danger they were warned against was that of being foolishly simple, over-confident, fool-hardy, courting failure by expecting the impossible. The warning applies to us to-day in many ways. There is a danger of divorcing religion from life, the actual needs and facts of life. We can make

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Brierley, *Life Indeed*, 226.

igion a mystical thing with no basis of reason and no outcome in practice. We may neglect the command to be ready to give good grounds for the truth that is in us. Or we may have the coward's trust and the sluggard's trust, thinking that we are not called to devise means and work our brain, but just leave all things to God. Some things pass by the name of faith which God disowns. We are called to live in the world *for* the world. We need wisdom to do God's work. We need wisdom to guard our own faith and protect our own simplicity of heart and save our own Christian character. If we have not something of the prudence of the serpent we will not keep the harmlessness of the dove very long. A well-meaning good sort of man who is foolish and blundering can contrive to do a great deal of mischief in his time. Ignorance is no excuse for mistakes. In Browning's pregnant line, 'Ignorance is not innocence but sin.' For a useful life and for a strong character wisdom is needed, and nothing can excuse the neglect of seeking it.

There is a mawkish sentimentalism in some forms of literature which seems to make goodness synonymous with silliness. Even Dickens, a master in his art, makes many of his good people border more or less on lunacy, nearly always delightfully gullible and impossibly foolish. The folly in some way is opposed to enhance the goodness. But in practical life a man does not need to have a soft head in order to avoid having a hard heart. All such conceptions are due to a false notion of the Christian life. If at life is serious to us, we shall know that we must

devote every power we have to attain and maintain it. Hear Paul's sane advice, the echo of his Master's words, 'Brethren, be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men.'

Paul's own life was an illustration of his words, his combination of zeal and knowledge, of unwavering faith and great statesmanship, ingenuous in character and ingenious in plans to bring men to Christ; simple and sincere in faith, wise and prudent in life. Such a man runs the risk of being misunderstood. His simplicity is treated as duplicity, his wisdom is called cunning, his innocence is deemed design. The world cannot comprehend the higher unity of his complex character.

Our Lord Himself is our great example here as elsewhere, combining both factors in harmony. What instances of His wisdom we could recall, and yet where were there such purity of purpose and innocence of heart and perfect uprightness of life? He remains for us the Perfect Man, wise and simple, strong and tender, winsome in His integrity, graceful in His strength, with depth of nature and charm of manner. The Christian, who cannot be satisfied till Christ lives in him, should 'see life steadily and see it whole.' He should look at life through Christ's eyes. He need not be troubled by those conflicting elements which go to the building up of character. He knows that it is Christ's purpose and desire for him to grow in grace and knowledge and Christ-like nature. He finds the unity of opposites in union with his Lord.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Black, 'According to my Gospel,' 75.

## Ezekiel.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D., GLASGOW.

THE Book of Ezekiel is at the moment the storm-centre of Old Testament criticism. In Germany, America, and Great Britain the traditional view of the book and the man has in recent years been sharply challenged. Torrey, in his *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*, and James Smith, in his *Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: A New Interpretation*, despite the widest divergence in their respective estimates of the purpose of the book, and a difference of no less than four or five centuries in their view of the date of its composition, have independently reached the conclusion that its historical

implications point to a background in the reign of Manasseh, and not, as has hitherto been all but universally believed, in the reign of Zedekiah at the close of the Judaean monarchy. Further, Curt Kuhl, in a review of Torrey's book in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*,<sup>2</sup> confesses that twenty years' study of the book has made it increasingly clear to him that Ezekiel can scarcely have been a prophet of the Exile, and he maintains that Old Testament science will have to consider very seriously the question whether Ezekiel must not be

<sup>2</sup> No. 2, 1932, cols. 27-29.

assigned to an earlier period, possibly even to the reign of Manasseh.

In view of these challenges of traditional opinion, a special welcome will be accorded to Volkmar Hertrich's careful discussion of the problems raised by the man and his book.<sup>1</sup> In the first half of his discussion Hertrich sketches and criticises the contributions made to the criticism of Ezekiel since the appearance of Ewald's volume in 1868, dealing briefly with Smend, Cornill, Bertholet, Kraetzschar, Jahn, Winckler, Kessler, and Kittel, and at much greater length with Herrmann, Hölscher, and Torrey; in the second half he goes through the book chapter by chapter, and reaches conclusions which differ in important respects from those of all his predecessors, but which seem to account satisfactorily for many of the curious phenomena presented by the book.

What are the problems involved in these phenomena? They may be thus briefly summarized: (i) the structure of the book itself, (ii) the destination of the oracles of which it is composed, (iii) the personality of Ezekiel, and—of subordinate importance—(iv) the system of dating which runs through it.

(i) The structure of the book. Is the book a unity? The older scholars answered this question unhesitatingly in the affirmative. They maintained that no Old Testament book bore so obviously the impress of a single mind or was marked by so deliberate and orderly a progress of thought. This view was disputed by Herrmann in his *Ezechielstudien*, who recognized that, like Isaiah and Jeremiah, the Book of Ezekiel (chs. 1-39) was a collection of independent pieces extending over a long period of years, not a continuous 'book' in the strict sense of the word. It was reserved for Hölscher to deny the unity of the book altogether. He maintained that it reflects two entirely different minds—the prophet, aglow with passion and imagination, who wrote in verse, and the redactor who is responsible for chs. 33-48 and large sections of chs. 1-32, who wrote over a century later, and in prose. Hertrich argues forcibly against what he calls Hölscher's 'hypothetical presuppositions'—among others, against the idea that Ezekiel, as a poet, cannot have written prose—Sir George Adam Smith has demolished this argument as it has been applied by Duhm to Jeremiah—and he further maintains that much that Hölscher claims for Ezekiel ought, on his own principles, to be assigned to the redactor. It is impossible here to enter into detail: suffice it to say that there are three stages

<sup>1</sup> *Ezechielprobleme* (Töpelmann, Giessen; M. 7.20).

in the history of the criticism of the book: (a) exhibits a real unity, (b) the seeming unity has been superimposed on independent pieces, (c) there is no unity at all.

(ii) To whom were the oracles addressed? This is the question which has been most hotly debated by recent critics, and which has led to a serious reconsideration of the scenery of Ezekiel's prophetic activity. The traditional view, of course, is that he was an exile addressing fellow-exiles. But any one who reads the book with the least attention feels that the theme, at any rate of chs. 1-24, is the doom of *Jerusalem*, and that the sins which render that doom inevitable are the sins of *Jerusalem*. Ch. 22<sup>1-18</sup>, with its detailed denunciation of the wickedness prevalent there, is addressed to no distant audience, present only to the prophet and his hearers' imagination; it is addressed to the 'bloody city' itself. What would be the relevance of a succession of impassioned appeals to the exiles, which perpetually envisaged, not *their* condition, but the conditions of the city from which they were separated by many scores of miles? At the most one might say that the prophet was striving to bring home to their consciences the doom of Jerusalem as a religious necessity. Even so, one is uneasily conscious of the irrelevance of these addresses as thus explained, especially as they are charged with all the vehemence of the old prophet's appeal.

But again, on the testimony of the book itself, the people among whom Ezekiel's lot is cast are 'rebellious house' (2<sup>5f.</sup> 12<sup>2</sup>), they are as briars, thorns, and scorpions (2<sup>6</sup>). Now, according to Jeremiah (ch. 24), this would be anything but just characterization of the exiles; these were 'the good figs,' and they are deliberately contrasted with the 'very bad figs,' which symbolize those who remained behind in the land and escaped the doom of exile. The people addressed by Ezekiel are denounced in terms which instinctively recall the sins for which Jeremiah denounced the people of Jerusalem. The most natural inference is that Ezekiel's hearers are not the exiles deported with Jehoiachin in 597, but the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this conclusion has been crystallized by recent discussion almost into a practical certainty.

Hertrich clinches his argument by going carefully through the book, chapter by chapter. Let a few illustrations suffice. The prophet's pictorial representation, on a tile, of a city exposed to a furious siege (ch. 4) gains enormously in grim significance, if he is himself in the city whose impending fate he depicts, as does also the harrowing

picture of the famine rations to which he threatens it will be reduced, if he himself is destined to share the horrors which he foretells, but which, to his hearers, with their incurable optimism, seem incredible. More convincing still is the fact that in 12<sup>10</sup> this latter message is unambiguously addressed to *the people of the land*, as are also the dreadful threats of ch. 7 (cf. v.7), which are clear enough, despite the textual obscurities in which they are embedded. Again, in ch. 12, when he symbolically indicates the doom of exile by wandering forth with the scanty outfit of a traveller, it is clear from his answer to the men who ask him what he means by so doing, that they themselves are the men for whom this doom is impending, not men whom it has already overtaken. In the Hebrew text this reference is still discoverable, though only in a single word, 'I am *your* sign,' i.e. a sign to *you* (12<sup>11</sup>): in the Greek it has been entirely obliterated; but the Syriac, which reads the second person plural throughout, undoubtedly preserves the true text, 'I am a sign to *you*; as I have done, so shall be done to *you*; ye shall go into captivity.' Further, the threat in 20<sup>45-49</sup> (M.T. 21<sup>1-5</sup>) that a supernatural conflagration will scorch the 'negeb,' the *south* land, bare, is only intelligible from the standpoint of a speaker in Palestine, not in Babylon. The description of the Temple, in the threat of its profanation, as 'the delight of *your* eyes' (24<sup>21</sup>), gains its pathetic force from the fact that it is addressed to the people of Jerusalem, whose eyes were daily gladdened by the sight of it; and the terrible indictment in ch. 16 is expressly addressed throughout in the second person singular feminine to Jerusalem (16<sup>2</sup>). Further, the prophet's audience in 33<sup>23-25</sup> is unmistakably in the homeland: his message of doom is hurled at those who claim, as the true heirs of Abraham, to be in possession of the land: 'the land,' they say, 'is given unto *us* or inheritance.' It is difficult, if not impossible, to evade the cumulative effect of these passages, and they are but a few out of many. Apparently, therefore, the prophet is in Jerusalem, addressing the people of Jerusalem, before the final blow has fallen.

(iii) The personality of Ezekiel has always been something of a riddle. On the traditional view, it is one of almost unexampled complexity—at once priest and prophet, poet and theologian, strange blend of the old prophetic fire with a scrupulous devotion to the technicalities of ceremonial, gifted with a rich imagination, yet pedestrian to the point of an almost mathematical rigidity, passionate in ethical appeals, yet so doughty a champion of a galactic religion that he has been called the father

of Judaism, methodical beyond any prophet in the presentation of his message and the march of his argument yet the victim of catalepsy; while to these curiously divergent—some would say irreconcilable—traits has to be added the possession of such supernormal powers as second sight. 'Two souls' seem to have dwelt within that single breast. That is one explanation of these disconcerting phenomena: the other is that the book reflects 'two worlds'—the world of Ezekiel and that of the redactor. The moment a redactor is postulated, the phenomena cease to be disconcerting; they are relegated respectively to these two disparate sources.

In his detailed analysis Hertrich shows much plausible ingenuity in effecting this separation. In chs. 1-3, e.g., he distinguishes between the authentic vision and call, on the one hand (3<sup>22f.</sup> 2<sup>6</sup>-3<sup>9</sup>), and what he regards as its fantastic setting, on the other. The story of the vision and the call is in the grand manner; both the experience and the description of it, which are worthy of comparison with that of Jeremiah, put Ezekiel in the great prophetic succession. But in the elaborate vision of the glory of Jahweh which precedes it in ch. 1, we breathe another air: it is not the reflex of a genuine prophetic experience, but the theosophic speculation of a time when the Temple no longer existed, and its aim was to demonstrate the uniqueness of Israel's God over against the Babylonian pantheon. Hertrich detects a similar distinction between the Jerusalem prophet and the exilic redactor in the crucial narrative (chs. 8-11) which begins with the description of the idolatries in the Temple, whether Ezekiel was miraculously transported in spirit (8<sup>3</sup>), and ends with the death of Pelatiah (11<sup>13</sup>), which he witnessed under similar conditions of ecstatic transport (11<sup>1</sup>). Hertrich's analysis would dissipate the assumption that Ezekiel was gifted with second sight. On his view Ezekiel was actually present, and not merely in spirit, at the scenes he describes. In ch. 8 he moves through the Temple precincts from point to point, observing with horror one idolatry after another; he then delivers a denunciatory speech (11<sup>5-12</sup>), and the whole scene dramatically concludes with the sudden death of Pelatiah (11<sup>13</sup>). From a comparison of Am 7<sup>1</sup> with Jer 1<sup>10</sup> it is argued that the phrase 'Yahweh brought me' (יְהִי נָגֵן 87. 14. 18) means no more than that the impulse to make his itinerary of the Temple came from Jahweh. According to Hertrich this narrative has been set by the exilic redactor in a Babylonian framework: Ezekiel is in Babylon, and it is by the mysterious

operation of the Divine Spirit (8<sup>3</sup> 11<sup>1</sup>) that he is, as it were, transported to Jerusalem, and enabled to witness what is happening there. Chs. 9 and 10, we are told, are interpolations by the same hand and have a purely ideal character. If this be so, we must at any rate allow that the prophet was fortunate in his interpolator, as the description, with its masterly reticence, of the destroying angel dealing death to the idolatrous worshippers, and the picture, suggested but not drawn, of the guilty city about to be consumed by supernatural fire scattered from the Divine chariot, are among the most awe-inspiring things in the Old Testament. Herntrich further argues that chs. 40-48, which envisage the future in a way so different from chs. 34-37, where the cult is barely mentioned, are certainly not from the hand of Ezekiel, but probably from the writer of ch. 1, who was, we may conjecture, a disciple of Ezekiel. This section is 'literature,' priestly composition, the product of reflection and not of that direct contact with life which the unredacted sections of chs. 1-24 manifest in every line.

The book undoubtedly received its present form in Babylon. The genuine prophecies contained in chs. 1-39 were delivered by Ezekiel himself in Jerusalem between 593 and 586: these were probably taken to Babylon by Ezekiel himself in one of the later deportations, and there, in common with the historical and other prophetic books, they were subjected to that process of redaction which criticism has taught us to associate with the Exile. Such is Herntrich's explanation of the divergent phenomena presented by the book.

(iv) There remains the problem of the dates which appear at intervals throughout the book. What is the system which governs them? To this problem Herntrich makes a valuable contribution by suggesting that there are two systems—one, exilic, represented by 1<sup>2</sup> 33<sup>21</sup> 40<sup>1</sup>, and the other, pre-exilic, represented by all the other dates. The

former counts from the captivity of Jehoiachin in 597: this is probably from the hand of the redactor, who may himself have been among those then deported; the latter, which makes no mention of captivity, dates from the accession of Zedekiah and is from the hand of Ezekiel himself. In this connexion Herntrich offers a happy solution of the opening words 'in the thirtieth year,' which have been a crux from time immemorial. This phrase has been variously interpreted as the thirtieth year of Manasseh, of Josiah, of Nabopolassar, the thirtieth year after the publication of Deuteronomy, or the thirtieth year of Ezekiel's own life. Herntrich ingeniously proposes to read 'third' for 'thirtieth,' i.e. the third, dating from the accession of Zedekiah (cf. Ezk 24<sup>1</sup> with 2 K 25<sup>1</sup>). This dating would be Ezekiel's own, and his call would thus be assigned to July-August 593. 1<sup>2</sup> is a gloss, but a correct gloss, on 1<sup>1</sup>.

The general result of recent criticism is to make it highly probable that Ezekiel was not an exilic prophet, addressing an audience whom he has to summon before his imagination, but a pre-exilic prophet in Jerusalem, addressing, like Jeremiah, the people of Jerusalem. The other 'world' represented by so much of the book is not the world of the prophet Ezekiel, but of the theological and priestly redactor. Herntrich's conclusion is that Ezekiel stands to gain enormously by the removal of these accretions. He is now seen to be 'a man of quite monumental greatness,' worthy to stand by the side of his great contemporary Jeremiah. Indeed, 'in his exalted conception of God, which in its transcendence has been reached but never surpassed, he towers above Jeremiah. Here, from His unique height, speaks the God of the Old Testament as the Other, who separates a man from Himself to be the witness of His honour. Like a theme from a fugue of Bach, there runs through the book the solemn refrain, "So shall ye learn that I am Jahweh."'

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### The Churches and Peace.<sup>1</sup>

THIS is a new contribution to the Sammlung in which Professor Wrede's essay appears. Professor

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Heinrich Frick, *Die Kirchen und der Krieg* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.1.50).

Frick of Marburg surveys the problem of the Church's duty towards the movement for peace, moved partly by the recent deputation of Church leaders in Britain to the Prime Minister, and partly by the situation in his own country. The essay, it must be confessed, reaches no definite conclusions.

vidently Professor Frick is impressed by two ings; one is the sincere division of opinion among Christians upon the problem of war, and the other the danger as well as the value of such an ex- ession as 'a moral equivalent for war' (to quote the words of Professor William James). He seems to recognize that the latter phrase may become a lib utterance, as indeed it does become, in certain circles. He pleads for the heroic following of

Jesus as the only real interpretation of it for Christians. Yet he pleads for a recognition of the fact that a Christian soldier may be equally satisfied in his conscience. The tone of the essay is high, and, though there are no very definite conclusions, it is refreshingly free from the 'superior' tone which afflicts so many pacifist proclamations.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Tree of Life in Eden.

The narrative of the Biblical Paradise contains many difficult points. One of them has always been pitifully neglected: the problem of the tree of life. In most cases the discussion is confined to the tree of knowledge and the eating thereof, or least this is the central point, and the difficult question of the tree of life is little heeded. Some scholars take the easy way: they expunge the passage. Others contend that man, although living in paradise in the proximity of the tree of life, and although the eating thereof was not bidden, nevertheless did not eat from that tree. Why not? By mere chance? At all events they could eat.

In 1928 at a Congress at Oxford, I pointed out that the man not only could eat from the tree of life but that he actually did, and that this tree was a *φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας*, their ambrosia (a-mr-ta) the remedy of the gods against death. Their being driven out of paradise means death, or being driven away from the tree of life (Gn 3<sup>24</sup>). Against this way of taking it is alleged the remark, 3<sup>22</sup>: 'the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest *ἵνα* he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.' But *ἵνα* does not always mean 'lest', but also 'lest further', 'lest more' (cf. 1<sup>17</sup>, 1 S 13<sup>19</sup>). Thus Gn 3<sup>22</sup> does not exclude the man in paradise has eaten from the tree of

This is in my view the only way to solve the problem of the tree of life. They who will not go this way must leave the problem unsolved, as they usually do. Either they pass it over silently, or

they expunge it from the text. Indeed, no reasonable answer is to be given why man should not have eaten from a tree so within reach as the tree of life, nor is the part that plays the tree of life in the garden of Eden to be realized. It stays there as a sentinel in the attic. And just these two questions remain usually untouched in the discussion on the narrative of paradise.

This narrative must be taken this way. The Biblical writer did not invent the two trees of paradise either, he borrowed them from the old material. Now the eastern Semitic peoples relate of a dwelling-place of the gods (a paradise) with a microcosmic character. To the inventory belongs always a tree of life, plant of life, water of life, etc. Only gods are there, it is forbidden for man. At the entrance are monstrous beings (cherubs) to prevent man from coming in lest he acquires eternal life like the gods. Now the Biblical narrative is different in one momentous way: the Biblical paradise is not only a *talaktu*—place of Jahve (Gn 3<sup>8</sup> *תְּהִלָּה*), but it is as much a dwelling-place of man. According to the Biblical narrator, man is as well immortal as the God and may eat of the tree of life. Hence the absence of the cherubs. But after his transgression of the Divine command man was driven out from the tree of life, and the cherubs appeared on the stage, and man has become mortal.

This, I think, is the clear meaning of the narrative. This important point of the narrative should not be overlooked for the sake of the tree of knowledge in order to wring therefrom an intended meaning.

H. TH. OBBINK.

Utrecht.

## Acts viii. 13.

MORE than one reason has been advanced as to why Mark left Paul and Barnabas at Perga. A theory which appeals to the writer is that either at Perga, or somewhere between Paphos and Perga, Paul changed his mind.

Had there been an original intention to go to Ephesus? This has been suggested. Though Ramsay, in *H.D.B.* v. 391<sup>st</sup>, says: 'If Ephesus had been his aim, he would have taken the easy, natural, and frequented road which trade and intercourse ordinarily followed. Instead of doing so he crossed Taurus by a very difficult path . . . it seems beyond doubt that a person who went by this way as far as (Pisidian) Antioch had as his aim simply to reach that city.'

Yet it is possible that until the Perga incident the intention had been to go to Ephesus and work back along the Syrian route to Syrian Antioch. Did Paul change his plans for reasons not stated, and decide on Pisidian Antioch as the starting-point? The event at Lystra led to further change, for the purpose suggested in Ac 14<sup>22</sup>. So that the original intention was very much affected.

When the decision was made at Perga, did the young man, John Mark, rebel against the change of plan? Had the great trek from Ephesus to Syrian Antioch with its missionary work so appealed that he would take nothing less, and 'returned to Jerusalem'? Is this another case of the rebellion of youth?

I am not prepared to accept Chase's suggestion in *H.D.B.* iii. 246<sup>st</sup>, that it is possible Mark was among the 'traitors' at Antioch, referred to in *Galatians*, even though Barnabas is mentioned. I prefer to think that the missionary trek from Ephesus fired Mark's imagination. The bitter disappointment over change of plans led to rebellion, and this alone is sufficient to account for the break between him and Paul.

If Mark is the young man who fled from the grasp of the crowd in Gethsemane, and if he is the young man who, first at the Sepulchre, was found there by the women, this is surely evidence of real love for Jesus. He might never be a great leader, but he had sturdiness of character which recognized an opportunity, took it, and rebelled if he felt the leader or leaders might not be doing the right thing.

Paul sought later to get into Asia (Ac 16<sup>8</sup>). Was Ephesus now the object? He could not forget the place—great and important; supremely so from its position for the cause of the Kingdom.

Later he went there and made a long stay. But Philippi came in between, and, as far as Paul is concerned, this was an all-important experience for him.

We know that years afterwards Mark was somewhere on the western side of Asia Minor. Col 4<sup>13</sup> speaks of the possibility of his visiting Colosse. When he comes from Ephesus to Rome to visit Paul, Timothy is urged to bring Mark with him. Evidently the latter is either in Ephesus or in neighbourhood.

Is Mark placed in a more favourable light when we think of the 'rebellion,' especially when we think of the friendship of Barnabas? The great soul, who usually championed difficult causes, would not let Paul go alone on the hazardous journey to Pisidian Antioch. But he did not forget the young rebel, who had wanted to carry on with the original plans. And this rebel made good—for he is profitable to me for the ministry. If the idea suggested above is practicable, the Mark had been profitable in the very decision that fired his imagination on his first missionary journey.

'Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and . . . Substitute Ephesus for Jerusalem and think what it would mean for Mark as he thought travelled to that great port and centre of life and trade. For him it was the beginning, not merely of one journey, but of a life of service for the Lord he loved. The disappointment was too great to be borne when the plans were changed. He did not want half measures, even though the leader was Paul.'

T. J. PENNELL

### The Close of the Galilean Ministry.

Dr. MICHAEL, in his article on 'The Close of the Galilean Ministry' in the September Expositor, while referring practically all the masses of the fourth chapter of Mark to a setting immediately preceding Jesus' enforced departure from Galilee, makes a possible exception of 'the case of sayings in vv. 21-25.' To my mind these fit quite as well as any of the other sections of the chapter into the situation which Dr. Michael actually recreates.

The disciples are disappointed at the proposed withdrawal, and complain that the night is about to be hidden. Jesus replies that the hiding of light is only a temporary measure, that though

essage must, by stress of circumstances, be kept secret for a while so far as Galilee is concerned, it to the end that sooner or later it may shine forth again.

Then, since His enemies have also been listening, if it is desirable that His intention to leave Galilee be kept secret, He uses cryptic words of warning, busing those who are of the inner circle to be careful to choose the vital message from the verbiage with which He has found it necessary to cover it up.

He that hath (*i.e.* the initiated) will grasp the meaning, but he that hath not (the uninitiated spy) will miss even the meaning he thinks he can take from the words he has heard.

I feel that Dr. Michael's thesis is well sustained, and would suggest that no exception be made of these verses, whose tendency is surely to strengthen it.

W. FRASER MUNRO.

*Wesley Church Parsonage,  
Hamilton, Bermuda.*

## Entre Nous.

### Bramwell Booth—A Tragedy?

When he was only three years old Catherine Booth recognized that her oldest child had a very unusual power of love and sympathy. Driving home in a carriage from a meeting Mrs. Booth was in an accident, and she writes: 'You would have been pleased to see what concern the little creature manifested about me when I lay on the sofa at Mr. Scott's. He seemed to forget everybody but me.' Towards the end of Bramwell Booth's life, Mr. Clasen, who had studied the differences between William Booth and his son, wrote: 'William Booth loves mankind: Bramwell Booth loves me.'

When only in his early teens Bramwell Booth already showed outstanding business capacities, and powers of work and concentration. 'His thoughtfulness for the real interests of the Mission, his responsibility as to business, his manly dealing with men and things is in my estimation very estimable,' writes his father. He is only thirteen when he is set to find out some discrepancy in the accounts, and we are told that he worked over them for seventy-two hours. At sixteen he is running a chain of shops to provide cheap food for the people, and is carrying a heavy burden of worry over the financial position of the Mission. He early set his heart on becoming a doctor, and when his parents think it right to discourage this, tough heart-broken, he makes up his mind to do what they wish and gives himself to the Mission. But for several years he distrusts his powers as a teacher and longs for secular employment. On the eve of his nineteenth birthday we find his father writing to him: 'It seems ten thousand lies that with this crying need for preachers, you with your *views*, capacity, and opportunities should

be lying dormant. If you can preach without injury to your heart it seems to me that you are throwing away a splendid opportunity of serving your generation. . . . You cannot judge of your ability under present circumstances.' And Bramwell replied: 'I only fear to step into a path which in days to come I cannot walk in. I only shrink from going before, when perhaps I ought to follow after. It seems *so easy* to make a mistake, and the results of a mistake may prove so disastrous both to others and oneself that I tremble when I think of them—and sooner than become a hindrance to God's cause and take the place for which another would be better fitted, and in which another would be more blessed, I would *die*.' Out of the wilderness years of hesitation and distrust of his own capacity he came out 'mastered by God and master of himself by God's grace to a triumphant ministry.' And from that time onward until 1912 he acted as Chief of Staff to his father. In 1912 he succeeded him as the second General—to be deposed seventeen years later by the High Council of the Army. The story of his life has now been told by his oldest daughter, Commissioner Catherine Bramwell Booth—*Bramwell Booth* (Rich & Cowan; 10s. net). And it has been told in the way that he would have wanted. 'There must be no bitterness,' he said again and again before he died—his death occurred just four months after his deposition. 'After some time my mother left us, and my father at once said to me, "If I die, Catherine, remember, there must be no bitterness. I forgive, you and the others must forgive too. They want to change the General's plan, they must know I shall never agree."

There is no need to discuss here the reasons

the Council had for desiring a change in government. Whether or not they were actuated solely by a desire for more democratic control, it is clear from the biography that it was no autocratic temper in Bramwell Booth himself which brought about his own tragedy. His opposition to any change came from his loyalty to the first General and to those last wishes which he had expressed in the Deed Poll of the Army—his love for William Booth coloured his action in the end, as it had coloured every relationship of his life.

One or two points might be touched on. First his attitude to woman's work. We find him writing after he became General. 'We have led the world in the matter of woman's powers and ministry, and we must not fall behind now when all mankind is following. . . . Bear in mind that it is not only a principle with us, but it is a very strong personal desire on my own part that the women of The Army should be kept to the front; and that the married women should be made to feel that their responsibilities are not all dissolved in those of their husbands when they marry.' On this point Catherine Booth says: 'Opinion on the matter has moved so far in advance of what it was fifty years ago that it is difficult to appreciate the temerity of the men who sent women, many of them quite young, to take full charge of mission stations. That women should preach, perform the marriage service, and bury the dead was staggering to the average man and woman of that day. The part women have played and do play in the work of The Army is to their credit, but far more is it to the credit of the two men, father and son, who gave the opportunity. They were reviled for it, but have they not been justified? Who would venture to predict what The Salvation Army would have been without its women officers? . . . And no institution for the governing and teaching of mankind in what concerns the moral and spiritual nature will reach its full stature, nor exercise its highest powers, unless the qualities of human nature as represented in man and woman, the mother and the father, share in its creation.'

The social work of the Army owed its inception to Bramwell Booth. 'The lad pottering about in the back streets of Hackney and Bethnal Green, tasting and touching the degradation of dirt and overcrowding, pondered and prayed and conceived the idea of sending workers to live in the slums and raise the "slummers." His personal influence obtained the first volunteer for this work. Later this form of service became known as the Slum Work of The Salvation Army.'

How much the Army of the first General owed to the Chief of Staff may be seen from the following quotations. 'I am not happy about the doctrine widely spread, that makes so much depend on our keeping up certain outward things. Jesus Christ and the Cross of Calvary are just as worthwhile when losing ground as when winning. The gospel of success has gone far enough with us—perhaps! *Perhaps we shall learn.*'

'As to this Hallelujah business, let me say, go steady. We know the ease with which "fizzy" can be substituted for *reality*. I am daily more satisfied that what we want is the *Divine*, and ought we not to strive to make it difficult to "get up" anything which can take the place of it?'

In a way Bramwell Booth was driven beyond his strength. We find him saying, 'This feeling that you are a poor sinner loaded with guilt if you stop work for ten minutes, even in a railway train is really dreadful.' But the business was not dry to him, meetings were not monotonous, and men were not ordinary; all were transfigured. 'Within this outward activity was a hidden life of the spirit, a walled-in garden of the soul, where the prophet, priest, and king became a little child and talked to God with a child's abandon; a place to which he knew the entrance, where, as he put it himself, "there is only room for two to walk side by side," and where the secret of the Lord was unfolded to him. Here is the clue to his humility, to his patience and love. But the "mystic" is shy; by inference rather than by any direct word he may here and there be described in letters and writings there are illuminating flashes which show him to the discerning. In the diary intermittently kept in the 'seventies when he was in his teens, for example: "Oh, for more of God with me, in me, round and about, underneath and above. Oh, to be swallowed up in Him . . . in Him who is infinite strength, wisdom, Love."

#### Sympathy.

'One evening in a meeting where there were several rows of kneeling penitents he [Bramwell Booth] beckoned to his daughter Mary, in whose command the meeting took place. She went to his side expecting to be told to deal with someone instead he said, "Mary, look at their boots. The state of a man's boots is generally a sign whether he is really hard up or not." And, pointing out one man, "His shoes are very poor, go and find out about him. He must be helped."

<sup>1</sup> Catherine B. Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, 259.

## Xenophon and St. John.

In his book, *The Testament of Glory*, Mr. G. O. Griffith draws a striking parallel between the presentation of Socrates in Xenophon and Plato on the one hand, and the presentation of Jesus by the Synoptists and St. John on the other. Xenophon gives the conversation of Socrates on practical conduct, while Plato gives us the 'theoretical Socrates' who deals in large principles. Thus, if the question arises, How far has Plato platonized the discourses of Socrates? We may also inquire, How far has St. John Johannized the discourses of Jesus? 'Now, just as Xenophon's record, for all its dissimilarity, provides convincing evidence in favour of the general truth of Plato's picture, so the other Gospel writers provide evidence in support of St. John. For Xenophon, though it is outside from his own purpose, intimates that Socrates' conversations did in fact range beyond those questions of practical conduct which he (Xenophon) reports, and comprehended in their circuit those transcendental themes which Plato concentrates upon; and in the same way the other Gospel writers unconsciously support St. John, because, though their approach to the teachings of Jesus is distinct from his, yet they reproduce Sayings which point in precisely the same direction as these Johannine passages which we are now considering. Thus it is not St. John but St. Matthew and St. Luke who give us the Saying: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." And it is St. Mark who reports the Saying about the Last Things: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, not even the Son, but only the Father."

Moreover, to continue our parallel, Plato's picture of Socrates receives support from another and very different quarter. It is supported by the testimony of Socrates' enemies, who accuse him of introducing heretical views of divinity—that is, of discussing just those transcendental subjects which Plato concentrates upon. And in the same way St. John's picture is supported by the testimony of the enemies of Jesus. For though, according to St. John, Jesus expressly turned aside the charge of claiming absolute deity, yet the persistent accusation of blasphemy which His enemies levelled against Him, witnesses to the existence in His teaching of that exalted strain which St. John reproduces.<sup>1</sup>

## 'The Word.'

'And here, perhaps, another of these keywords challenges us. What is the meaning of "the Word"? We know that St. John was employing a philosophic term as familiar in certain circles in his own day as the *élan vital* in our own: but we know also that the task of translating that term into an English equivalent has baffled our scholars: thus Moffatt prefers to insert the untranslated original (*Logos*).

'We may perhaps find a limited illustration of its significance if we think of a great writer about to compose a masterpiece. First the book must exist as a living conception, a creative idea, in his mind. In the beginning it has that invisible, hidden life; it lives with him and he with it. So we may say of Scott's *Ivanhoe*: "In the beginning was the idea, and the idea was with Scott, and the idea was Scott"—that is, was the veritable expression of him. In other words, this creative conception was the genesis and genius of the book. The plot, the scheme, the characters and episodes were informed by it and kindled at the light of it. And so with every work of art, every picture or poem, every building or statue or symphony. In the beginning is the *logos*; the original, creative conception. So it is perhaps, in St. John's thought, with the Divine creation. Our analogy, of course, is by no means a complete one, but it may be serviceable. In the beginning is the Word, and in the Word the whole universe has its hidden life. The Word is one with God, as the thought of a man is one with the man himself; and yet this oneness does not mean identity without distinction. The artist *communes* with the idea of his picture, the poet with the conception of his poem; it is one with himself, and yet he can regard it as other than himself; it is *with* him; and out of the communion between the thinker and his creative idea the work itself emerges. So God communes with the Eternal Word and out of that communion emerges the living universe.'<sup>2</sup>

## Failure and Success.

'Such men as Colet and Falkland are commonly accounted "failures." A Falkland dies broken-hearted; a Cromwell goes from success to success. Colet failed to effect reform from within the Church, and his efforts to do so are forgotten by all except a few specialists. Calvin succeeded where Colet failed. He imposed a Theocracy on the great Free City of Geneva; his *Institutes* supplied a Confession

of Faith and a manual of Church Government for Protestant Churches in every quarter of the civilized world. Yet, on a larger and a longer view, a Falkland and a Colet achieved "success" not less conspicuous than that of a Cromwell and a Calvin. Cromwell's Dictatorship was quickly followed by a Stuart restoration, and by a violent monarchical reaction; the scheme embodied in the Revolution Settlement was far more closely akin to the ideas of Falkland than to those of Cromwell. Falkland stood for a Parliamentary Monarchy and for religious toleration. Upon those two principles the settlement finally accepted by all parties was ultimately based. Colet stood for the reform of abuses without any breach in constitutional continuity, and for the application of historical and scientific methods to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. The English Church of to-day has purged itself of abuses, while preserving that form of Church Government which has come down to it from Apostolic days. All the more enlightened leaders in the religious world are to-day applying to Biblical criticism precisely the principles which Colet applied in lecturing to his Oxford students on the Pauline Epistles. Principal Tulloch has made clear the debt which the Liberal Theologians of the seventeenth century, men like William Chillingworth and John Hales of Eton, owed to Colet; but, in truth, Colet is the authentic Patriarch of the long line of students whose fearless application of the scientific method to Biblical criticism has given a special distinction to Anglican Theology. The authors of *Essays and Reviews*, of *Lux Mundi*, and of *Foundations* (to mention only three co-operative undertakings which during the last seventy-five years have emanated from Colet's University) are in the direct line of succession to Colet and Erasmus. Their insistence on the right and indeed the obligation to apply the historical method to Biblical exegesis; their views on Inspiration; their frank acceptance of the doctrine of "accommodation," or "Progressive Revelation" with all the implications of that doctrine—these represent only a few of the many debts which consciously or unconsciously they incurred to John Colet.<sup>1</sup>

#### Outwitted.

He drew a circle that shut me out—  
Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout,  
But Love and I had the wit to win :  
We drew a circle that took him in.

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. A. R. Marriott, *The Life of John Colet*, 5.

How well known these lines are! But how many of us know who wrote them. Or if we know the author's name know very little more. Edwin Markham, the American poet, has just passed his eightieth birthday, and an account of his life and work has been written by the journalist, Mr. William L. Stidger, who is a personal friend of Mr. Markham—*Edwin Markham* (Abingdon Press; \$2.50)—and has had many interviews with him. He gives the origin of 'Outwitted' as follows: Mr. Markham lost the savings of a lifetime through some friends who inveigled him into making some unsafe investments. 'He is always saying to us: "They thought they were doing the right thing. They really wanted to help me." On that strange day when the first wave of resentment swept in on his soul he cried out to himself: "No! I shall not let you in! There shall be no hatred in my heart. Love will outwatch the stars!" That wave of resentment subsided; his old philosophy of love came back and he found himself absent-mindedly drawing on a sheet of paper two circles; and then, before he knew what had really happened, he had written down his most famous quatrain, a terse and tremendous summing up of all of his philosophy of love, his social singing, his religious faith—"Outwitted."

Mr. Markham in his most important poem the 'Man with the Hoe' sets forth his social beliefs. But it is too long to quote, so we give what Mr. Stidger calls his terrific indictment of social injustice in "The Third Wonder":

'Two things,' said Kant, 'fill me with breathless awe :

The starry heaven and the moral law.'  
But I know a thing more awful and obscure—  
The long, long patience of the plundered poor.

We are also indebted to Mr. Markham for the following lines :

Is there a wound, O brother, in your heart,  
And would you have the secret grief depart ?  
Heal first your brother's sorrow, hush his moan,  
And that will heal the anguish of your own.